SEVERAL
TREATISES
OF
Worſhip & Ceremonies,

By the Reverend

Mr. *WILLIAM BRADSHAW*,

One of the firſt Fellows of *Sydney* Colledge in *Cambridge*;

Afterward Miniſter of *Chattam* in *Kent*, 1601.

Known by his learned Treatiſe *De Juſtificatione*.

---

1. *A conſideration of certain Poſitions Archiepiſcopal.*
2. *A Treatiſe of Divine Worſhip, tending to prove the Ceremonies, impoſed on the Miniſters of the Goſpel in* England, *in preſent Controverſe, are in their uſe unlawful.* Printed 1604.
3. *A Treatiſe of the Nature and Uſe of Things Indifferent.* 1605.
4. *Engliſh Puritaniſm, containing the main opinions of the ridgedeſt ſort of thoſe called Puritans in the Realm of* England. 1604.
5. *Twelve General Arguments, proving the Ceremonies unlawful.* 1605.
6. *A Propoſition concerning kneeling in the very Act of Receiving,* 1605.
7. *A Proteſtation of the Kings Supremacy, made in the name of the afflicted Miniſters, and opoſed to the ſhameful Calumniations of the Prelates.* 1605.
8. *A ſhort Treatiſe of the Croſs in Baptiſm.* 1604.

Printed for *Cambridge* and *Oxford*, and to be ſold in *Weſtminſter* Hall, and *Pauls* Church-Yard, 1650.

SEVERAL TREATISES

OF

Worship & Ceremonies,

By the Reverend

Mr. WILLIAM BRADSHAW.

One of the first Fellows of Sydney College in Cambridge,

Afterward Minister of Chattant in Kent, 1601.

Known by his learned Treatise De Justificatione.

---

1. A consideration of certain Positions Archiepiscopal.
2. A Treatise of Divine Worship, tending to prove the Ceremonies, imposed on the Ministers of the Gospel in England, in present Controversie, are in their use unlawful. Printed 1604.
3. A Treatise of the Nature and Use of Things Indifferent. 1606.
4. English Paramasses containing the [illegible] of the [illegible] called Puritans in the Realm of England. 1604.
5. Twelve General Arguments proving the Ceremonies unlawful. 1605.
6. A Proposition concerning Kneeling in the very [illegible] of Receiving. 1605.
7. A Protestation of the Kings Supplement made in the name of the Justified Adventurers, and [illegible] the [illegible] Calumniations of the Bachelors. 1605.
8. A short Treatise of the Cross in Baptism. 1604.

Printed for Cambridge and Oxford, and to be sold in Westminster Hall, and Pauls Church-Yard, 1650.

A conſideration of certain Poſitions Archiepiſcopal.

1. *Religion cannot ſtand without ſome Ceremonies, as kneeling,* &c.

REligion is the fear of God, to ſerve him preciſely according to his Word, and therefore it is called *Godlineſs, Iſa.*29.13. *Acts* 2.5. & 10.2. & 26.5. 2 *Tim* 3.5. *Heb.*9.1. *Jam.*1.27. As by Superſtition his Majeſty meaneth, when one reſtrains himſelf to any other Rule in the Service of God than is warranted by the Word. *Bas. dor. p.*15. Which is therefore called *Will-Worſhip. Col.*2.21,23.

Howſoever it be *Religion*, out of the fear and love of God, to keep his Commandements as well of the Second as Firſt Table, yet the conſcionable obſerving of the Commandments contained in the firſt Table is, by an excellency, called *Religion*; And whereas man cannot judge of ſuch obſerving the firſt and third Commandments, therefore is he eſteemed *Religious*, who maketh conſcience of the ſecond and fourth Commandements; In ſanctifying the Sabbath with ſuch an outward manner of Worſhip, as is not after mans invention, but according to Gods Word.

So that by *Religion*, in this poſition is meant the outward (eſpecially publique) worſhip of God: *Religion* being put for *Worſhip*, becauſe the fear of God to ſerve him preciſely according to his Word, is, of all the actions of men, eſpecially to be manifeſt in worſhipping God, who will be ſanctified in all them that come near him, if they offer ſtrange fire, *Lev.*10.3. *Religion* (then) being put for *outward Worſhip*, the Poſition is granted. For indeed the outward wor-

ship of God, doth consist only of Ceremonies, that is, outward demonstrations of inward Worship. But, how doth this follow, The outward Worship of God cannot stand without some Ceremonies, *Ergo*, It cannot stand without the Ceremonies in question. As though *Religion* had no better ground than *Diocesan Bishops* have, according to this Maxim: *No Ceremony, no Bishop.*

But more clearly to perceive the truth, it is to be considered, that some Ceremonies by nature, or general custome demonstrate inward worship, as not only signs thereof, but effects also. Other do the same, as signs only by Institution. By which instituted Ceremonies God is not worshipped except they be by himself prescribed; For as no fire could make any Sacrifice a savour of rest to God, but that which came from God, *Lev.*9.24. and 10.1,2. So no warrant can make outward worship, or any part thereof acceptable to God, but that which cometh from God, *Mat.*15.9.

Therefore it doth not follow, that because *kneeling* in Prayer is lawful, therefore the Ceremonies in question (namely the *Surplice*) be so too. For 1. Nature teacheth us to manifest inward reverence by outward gestures. 2. General custom amongst us maketh *kneeling* the most solemn sign of the greatest reverence. 3. In true Worshippers of God *kneeling* is not only a sign of inward Worship, but an effect also. 4. It is warranted by the Word. And 5. It is not appropriated to the outward Worship of God: For men do usually, and may lawfully, demonstrate their inward reverencing of men by kneeling. Whereas the Ceremonies in question (namely the Surplice) do not demonstrate inward Worship by Nature: For then all religious Worshippers would (at least) have a disposition to use the Surplice at all times, and in all places. (2.) None can affirm, that general custome maketh a Surplice a sign of inward Worship. Because the publike use of it is most what omitted or enforced, and there is no such matter as the private use thereof, and by private persons. In both which considerations it may be (3) denied to be an effect of inward Worship, and the rather if it cannot be proved to be as effect of the obedience of faith to some commandment of God, prescribing the same. Which (4.) cannot be; Seeing in all the New Testament there is neither Precept, nor Example, nor other matter of necessary conclusion warranting the same. And yet (5.) It is appropriated to the Service of God, and therefore superstitious, and not religious, especially being urged as it is.

2. *Ceremonies are lawful, when their doctrine is lawful.*

If

If by Doctrine of Ceremonies be meant their *ſignification*, then the *Theſis* is denied: For then other Popiſh Ceremonies may be reſtored. As *ſetting up of Candles*, to ſignifie that the works of all Chriſtians, *Phil.*2.15. eſpecially Miniſters, *Mat.*5.14, 16. ſhould ſhine before men; and yet it is pronounced in the third Injunction to be *deviſed by mans Phantaſie, beſides Scripture*, and therefore *Superſtitious*. And *unleavened bread* in the Lords Supper may ſignifie *Sincerity* and *truth*, 1 *Cor.*5.8. And yet by the Communion Book (*Rubrick* after the Communion, Sect. 5.) it is reformed, *To take away the Superſtition, which any perſon hath, or might have*: But many have, and may have Superſtition in Ceremonies retained.

If the meaning of the Poſition be this, *Ceremonies are lawful, when they are warranted by lawful Doctrine*, it is to be granted; but then the *Hypotheſis* muſt be denied. For it is *petitio principii* to affirm; that Ceremonies in queſtion are ſo warranted.

3. *The Doctrine of Ceremonies is part of the Goſpel.*

This Poſition is true, but only according to the diſtinction of the Doctrine of Ceremonies by inſtitution. Which Doctrine is either *affirmative*, ſhewing what Ceremonies by inſtitution are to be uſed, and thoſe be only the two Sacraments, which are indeed *Seales*, and not only Ceremonies. Or *Negative*, teaching what Ceremonies are not to be uſed, *viz.* Neither Ceremonies of the *Jews*, nor traditions of Elders, *Joh.*4.20,21,23. Neither *Carnal Rites*, *Gal.* 3.3. *Heb.*9.10. Nor commandments of men, *Col.*2.22.

Which negative Doctrine of Ceremonies is indeed according to the truth of the Goſpel, *Gal.*2.3,5,12,14. and that is contrary to the Ceremonial Law of *Moſes*. Becauſe that Law ſtood in carnal Rites, *Heb.*9.10,11. That is, Ceremonies inſtituted to inſtruct and direct the outward man unto the inward Service of God, and therefore was that Law called, *A carnal Commandment*, *Heb.*7.16. and thoſe Ceremonies accounted *Rudiments of the World*, *Gal.*4.3. So that after faith (that is, the Goſpel) came, that Law, and the Ceremonies thereof gave place, as being leſs perfect, a childiſh Pædagogy and beggarly Rudiments, 1 *Cor.*13.10,11. *Gal.*3.25. and 4.2,3,9. In reſpect of the more perfect Word of Chriſt, *Col.* 3.16. 2 *Cor.*3.13.17,18. Who is that *Meſſias*, who when he came, did tell us all things concerning the outward worſhip of God. *Joh.*4.19,20,25,26. But Chriſt never told us the Ceremonies in queſtion.

There-

Therefore if the Negative Doctrine against Jewish Ceremonies instituted by God to the purposes aforesaid, be part of the Gospell, or *Word of Christ*, much more is the Negative Doctrine against Ceremonies instituted by man to the same purposes, without warrant of the *word*, part of the Gospel, *Col.*2. 20,22,23. *Galat.*1. 6,7,8,10. And the rather, because the Word saith, That they, who burthen the Church with Ordinances of the world, which are Traditions after the Commandements and Doctrines of men, do not hold *Christ* the head, *Col.*2. 19, 20,22. and 3.1. and opposing such Traditions to the Commandements of God, and Faith of Jesus, maketh them part of the Beasts Mark, *Revel.*14.9,12. Hereunto accorderh that which is affirmed in the BOOK of Common-Prayer, in the Preface of Ceremonies, *viz. Christ his Gospell is not a Ceremonial Law (as much of* Moses *was) but it is a Religion to serve God, not in bondage of the Figure or shadow, but in the freedome of spirit.*

4. *Ministers refusing Conformity are Schismaticks.*

This word *Schisme*, according to the now received use thereof in the Church, signifieth *A voluntary rending of the* Church *only for matters of the outward Government therof.* So that, *Schismaticks* are by Dr. *Bancroft*, in his Notes before his Sermon at *Pauls* Cross, *an.*1588. defined as out of *Augustine*, to be such, *as retaining with us the* true Faith, *seperate themselves, from Orders and Ceremonies.* In which sence though *Brownists* (so called) may be deemed *Schismaticks*, yet cannot Ministers refusing only to conforme, be so accompted: Because, their Deprivation or Suspension notwithstanding, they do not seperate themselves from the Church, neither do they (indeed) forsake the Ministry of the Gospel, which they desire (before all worldly benefits whatsoever) to execute with a good Conscience, but are thrust from it; and therefore, If men, driven by Excommunication out of the Church be not Schismatiques, much lesse Ministers driven by deprivation or suspension only from the Execution of their Ministry.

This word *Schisme* is sometimes taken for any dissention in the Church, whereby the Peace, but not the Unity thereof is broken. 1 *Cor.*11.18. In which sense they are to be called, *Schismaticks*, who are specially to be blamed for such Dissention. But if all the Prelates cannot give one Argument soundly concluded from the word to prove, That the Ceremonies, in question may be prescribed by authority, and yielded unto by the Ministry, without sin, then are they Schismaticks, according to the judgment of the Apostle,

Who

who beseecheth the Brethren, *To mark them diligently, who cause Division and Offences, besides the Doctrine which they have learned, and to avoid them. For they that are such, serve not the Lord Jesus Christ, but their own bellies, and with fair speech and flattering deceive the hearts of the simple,* Rom. 16. 17, 18. By which Answer, Protestants do sufficiently justifie their Separation from the Papists: Much more may Ministers justifie their refusing to Conforme, yet without Separation. But when any such Argument shall be given (which hath not yet been heard of) then are Ministers refusing Conformity to be deemed *Schismaticks*. In mean while this Position is to be taken for *Petitio Principii*.

FINIS.

FINIS.

A Treatise of Divine Worship,

Tending to prove, that the Ceremonies imposed upon the Ministers of the Gospel in *England*, in present Controversie, are in their use unlawful.

CHAP. I.

Of Divine Worship in general.

DIvine Worship is any action or service that is immediatly and directly performed unto God himself, whether the true God or a false, whether commanded by Divine Authority, imposed by humane, or assumed upon our own heads and pleasures. For in this latitude of sense is Divine Worship to be conceived, that it may comprehend under it both true and false Worship.

2. Though all Actions and Services that Man performeth unto Man are not parts of Civil Worship, yet every Action and Service that Man performeth directly to God, is a part of Divine Worship, and ought meerly to concern his own glory. It being impossible to imagine how the Creature should perform any service, or do any action to the Creator himself but Worship. For the ground of Worship is the sence of some excellent eminency of goodness in the Party worshipped, and defect and inability to do an answerable good to a good received in the party worshipping,

for we need not to worship God if we could be as good to him as he is to us, and therefore (except we should mock him) because receiving all good from him, we are not able to do the least good unto him; all that we can do, is to worship him, that is, to glorifie him above all things; and debase our selves before him as nothing in his presence.

3. All special things therefore done in the Service and Worship of God, is Worship: and a part of that honour that is done unto him. And whatsoever special thing done in Divine Service, is not a special honour and worship unto God, must needs be a dishonour and abuse of his Majesty, who requireth nothing but worship at our hands, and unto whom we cannot possibly do any other good.

4. If therefore a man shall do any special Action in this Service of God, of which there is no use out of the same: and that Action so done, bring no special honour to God; the doing of it is a prophanation of the Name of God. For all special Actions done in the Service of God, must either bring special honour to God, or else they must needs dishonour him.

5. Divine Worship is Internal only or External also. Internal worship is meerly spiritual, and performed only within the temple of mans heart, of which none are witnesses but God and a mans own conscience. All the inward motions of the heart directed unto God are parts of this VVorship, as Faith, Hope, Confidence, Love, Fear and Joy in God, &c. which are all of them divers acts and parts of Inward worship, in every one of which God is honoured. All which spring from the apprehension of our own wants, and Gods infinite excellency and goodness towards us. We need not proceed any further in handling of this Worship, it nothing appertaineth to our present purpose.

6. External Worship is an expressing and setting forth of the Internal by outward signs and rites: By which, as by certain outward bodily shadows and colours, the spiritual and Inward Worship of God is made visible and sensible to others.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of Ceremonies in general.

THese signs and rites are called Ceremonies. A Ceremony is a corporeal adumbration of some hidden thing in the mind, that it desireth to affect others withall, in some effectual manner, for by such means as these, are the secrets of the soul disclosed and painted out or figured to our own and others bodily senses.

2. Such actions properly are ceremonial, that are meer shadows and signs, exhibiting nothing but some similitude and resemblance of such things as man is desirous, but not able to exhibite in substance and in deed. And therefore are called complements, because in doing them a man laboureth to supply that in a shadow, that he cannot do in substance. And hence it is that the more unable a man is to do that he would, the more he useth to supply his defect with signs and tokens.

CHAP. III.

Of Natural Ceremonies.

CEremonies are either Natural or Instituted. Natural Ceremonies are all such voluntary compositions and gestures of the body, as are with moderate deliberation used to shadow forth those hidden motions, affections, and habits of the mind, that are begotten in the mind by some goodness in those unto whom they are performed and done; for a man performeth no ceremony unto himself, but unto others, and the ground of that ceremony is in him unto whom it is performed.

2. For example: Authority in another, begetteth reverence in me. This reverence possessing and affecting my soul, it breedeth in me a desire to manifest it unto the party reverenced; but I cannot possibly do it by any other means, but by some bodily shadow and sign, whereupon nature teacheth me to bow the body; the like may be said of lifting up of hands, casting up the eyes, *&c.* All of which kind are certain natural impressions of the soul, made in and upon

the body, endeavouring in and by them to make her hidden motions so visible and effectual, as they may affect our selves and others.

3. Comlines and decency doth especially consist in the use of Ceremonies of this kind, and they have been ever carefully observed in the Church of God, as well before Christ as since, both in her publike and private ministrations; which wilfully to neglect, were to sin against God, and for any to inhibite only upon their will and pleasure, were impiety. But these Ceremonies in controversie are of another nature as shall afterward appear.

4. This first kind of Ceremonies, the more natural they are, and the more they shall appear to flow from the free and inforced will of him that acteth them, the more decent and of greater grace they are, for they are such shadows as are sent forth from our passions by the light of nature, and are not fit for any other use or signification.

5. And as nature only frameth them well, so if it shall appear that they proceed from her, and are not forced and wrung from men (*invita minerva*) she putteth into them such a light, that any of ordinary conceit may in the sign see the thing signified.

6. These Ceremonies though Natural, and therefore common to all men, yet are they not in all degrees universally the same, because having their original from the natural motions and conceptions of the mind, especially passion and affection, by which they are animated and formed, there being in the stock of mankind such diversity of natures and dispositions; such divers degrees of the same inclination; such a divers composition and mingling of affections, it cannot be but nature must needs vary and be divers in them.

7. And though they are natural, yet are they no: such as nature by violence forceth and wringeth from men (as the actions of panting and breathing) such as men cannot at their pleasure abstain from, or lay down; for laughter in extreme mirth, and weeping in great sorrow, though they be natural impressions and signs of: inward and hidden passions, yet: are they not Ceremonies; but such *signes* only are Ceremonies, wherein there is concurrence both of *nature* and *will*, in the framing and use of them, as appeareth in the particulars above specified; and therefore are such as may upon some special or particular occasions, be omitted or suppressed.

8. Thus much of *natural* Ceremonies. Instituted Ceremonies are such outward *rites* and *signs* as by reason of some Analogy or similitude

similitude, are ordained and appointed to signifie and shadow forth any *mystical truth*, they being not brought forth by nature to any such end or purpose. Of which kind are all the Jewish Ceremonies, Our Sacraments, All Paginish and Popish Rites, and those Ceremonies in present controversie. For none of all those externall Rites, do by nature signifie any such matter, but their uses and significations are put upon them only by the will of the *institutor* or user, and are not so much intended for decency and order, as for *solemnitie* and *state*.

9. Those things that are put to this Ceremonial use, being not made by nature to any such end or purpose, must, if they be not vain and fooliſh, borrow light from some *word* of *institution*, for the more *mystical* the Ceremonies of this kind are, and of secreter sense, of greater grace they are.

10. Natural Ceremonies, if by institution and appointment they be put to any other use than nature it self hath fitted them unto, do lose their name, and become instituted Ceremonies, as *kneeling* tied to eating and drinking in the Sacrament, *&c.*

CHAP. IV.

Of Civil and Religious *Ceremonies in general.*

THE Use of both these kindes of Ceremonies, that is, natural and instituted, is either in civil services of man to man, or in religious services of man to God, from whence Ceremonies receive a second Denomination, and are called (whether they be natural or instituted) either Civill or Religious Ceremonies.

2. Civil Ceremonies therefore are such *Rites* and *Ceremonies*, as are performed in Civill Offices and Duties between man and man, as they are members of a Civill Body, or Incorporation: The right use whereof is called Civility, and the contempt *rudeneſs*; the end of Civil Ceremonies is to signifie and shadow those inward affections that one man desireth to shew to another: In the due use of these Ceremonies consists *humanity*, *lowlineſs*, *courteſie*, *good manners*, *civil state*, *and pompe*, &c. Because the Ceremonies of this kinde are not controverted, we passe them by.

3. Religious Ceremonies are such outward Rites as are performed in religious Duties and services of man to God: and they

they are outward shadowes of *zeal, devotion, faith, holinesse, reverence of the Majesty of God, &c.*

4. In the use of these Ceremonies especially doth external worship consist, whether true or false.

5. Religious Ceremonies are either *common* or *proper*: Common Ceremonies are such as are equally used in civil and religious matters: bowing the knee used in prayer, is a religious Ceremony, signifying in that action a Divine Reverence of God. Yet it is not a Ceremony peculiar and proper to Religion, because it is a Ceremony that is and may be used to the Magistrate, to shadow forth also civill Worship due unto him. Of which nature all natural Ceremonies seem to be, and any instituted Ceremony may be, if it have no reference to Religion in the Use.

6. Though matters of Civill Order and Decency be very improperly called Ceremonies, they being rather matters of substance, and it being impiety wilfully and without necessity to neglect them in the Congregation of *Saints*, or to do any thing contrary unto them: Yet all things tending thereto, may for Doctrine sake be referred to this head. For though Gods worship do not consist in them, yet Gods worship is prophaned in the wilfull contempt and neglect of them. Yea as far forth as naturall and civill decency and comlinesse are outward shadowes of inward worship, They may be safely reputed parts of divine worship.

7. Matters therefore of Order and decency in the service of God are all such matters as are drawn from the ordinary civil Customes of men, and which for any to neglect wilfully, would seem to the reason of a naturall man a disorderly and unseemly thing. As to come to the Assembly clothed, and that in seemly and usuall apparell, according to our civill Callings in the world, to sit there quietly, and in a comely manner, in respect of composition of body, to give as much as may be, upper place to our civill Superiours; that the place of meeting be fair swept; that the Table of the Lord in the time of Communion, be spread after the civil fashion of the Country, with a fair table-cloth; that men pray bare-headed, *&c.* These Orders used in civill Meetings of men, wherein civill decency is observed and kept, ought not to be neglected in religious Meetings, and therefore they may be called common Ceremonies or Orders.

8. These Ceremonies of civil Order and decency, are of that nature

nature and necessity, that for the Magistrate wilfully to inhibite, were sin in him, and for any particular man not to use and observe as much as conveniently he can, (though Authority had never enjoyned them in particular) were impiety. And therefore they are of a far different nature from the Ceremonies in controversie: For let it be supposed to be no sin to use these when the Magistrate enjoyneth them: yea suppose them to be holy Ornaments and Rites, yet if no Authority humane or divine had instituted them, it had been no sin for any man to neglect them, nay it were a foul sin to use them. For example: Our Lords spiritual enjoyn every Minister in Divine Service, to wear a white linen Ephod or Surplice, they may (if it please them) as lawfully enjoyn him to have painted before and behinde two fair red crosses: but if a private man upon his own head should use his Surplice so, though it be an honourable signe that he addeth, it would be made a grievous crime.

9. They therefore do but gull the simple of the world, that from humane authority to institute such civil Orders as are above specified, do inferre that man hath authority to bring into the service and worship of God such Ceremonies, as are clean of another nature. As though because the Magistrate may ordain such Ceremonies, as without his ordinance, were impiety for a man not to observe, therefore he may ordain such Ceremonies which without his ordinance at least, were impietie and wickednes for any to use.

CHAP. V.

Of Ceremonies peculiar to Religion.

THose Ceremonies that are proper to Religion are such as in a peculiar manner are tied to religious persons actions and purposes only, especially such as are in a special manner tied to the solemn worship of God. In these Ceremonies consists the external form of divine worship, and they are the outward badges and cognizances of the same.

2. All Ceremonies used in the service of God, are either civil Ceremonies (to wit, such as are also of the same use out of the service of God) or holy Ceremonies, to wit, such wherein holiness consists in the due use of them; or else they are prophane, that is, such as have no use, or a superstitious use. The Ceremonies in controversie

controversie are not civil * Ceremonies: again it is granted, there is no holinesse in the use of them †, Therefore they are prophane Ceremonies, and by consequent, not to be mingled with holy things.

* For then the bare omission of them would argue rudeness and incivility.

† Some n'gher his M. have given it out that he would (if he cou'd) hang those that put holinesse in them.

3. As there are diversities of Religion and Churches, so there are diversities of Rites and Ceremonies, by which they are distinguished, and Ceremonies are the partition walls whereby (for the most part) one Church is divided from another. For he that shall with a more narrow eye seek into these things shall see, that for the most part, the diversities and varieties of Ceremonies are the begetters of diversity of Doctrines, and Opinions, whereby one Religion differeth from another.

4. The more one Church differeth from another in Rites and Ceremonies, the more it useth to differ in substance of Doctrine; and the more one Church draweth nearer unto another in Ceremonies, the more it draweth near unto it in substance of Doctrine. The Churches of *France* and *Scotland* in substance of Doctrine do so much the more differ from the Synagogue of *Rome*, by how much the farther they differ from her in Ceremonies, than other Churches; and some in the Church of *England* that do strive to come to *Rome* in Ceremonies, come so much the neater to her in Doctrine, as might appear by divers instances, if the matter were not too too apparent.

5. He that hates the Religion it self, hates all the shadowes and shews of the Religion; and he that loves the shadows and Rites of a Religion, he loves the Religion it self; he loves a Pope well that loves the triple Crown; he loves a Fryer well, that dotes upon his Cowl, and shaven crown; and out of question he loves a Masseprieſt with all his heart, that is mad upon his massing attire, or any part thereof.

6. As it is rudeness and want of civility, to neglect or contemn a Civil Ceremony, so it is prophanesse and irreligion to neglect or contemn a religious ceremony: and as outward civility consists in the due use of civil Ceremonies, so outward holiness and religion consists in the due use of all Religious Ceremonies: Those Ceremonies therefore are prophane and not beseeming the true worship of God, that are so far from any shew of holinesse in the use of them, that they make the partie that refuseth the use of them to seem, and to be reputed pure, holy, and precise; of which nature our Ceremonies in controversie are.

7. As Civil Ceremonies tend to the honor of them unto whom

civil

civil worship is due, and is a part thereof: So Religious Ceremonies tend to the honor of him unto whom religious worship is due, and is a part thereof: neither can a man possibly imagine how any thing should be religious, whether a substance or a Ceremony, but it must needs respect him that Religion it self respecteth; is therefore we performe civil honour unto those unto whom we performe civil Ceremonies, so we performe Religious and Divine honours unto those that we obey in a Religious Ceremonie. They therefore that claim and performe obedience therein, do claim and performe that which is due only to God.

8. Nothing intended or done by man is an honour to God, but that which is an obedience unto God in some Commandement. All Ceremonies therefore of Religion that are an honour unto God, must be commanded by God himself: and to bring in such Ceremonies into his worship as are no honour to him, is to mock God.

9. All Religious Ceremonies or Ceremonies of Religion, are spiritual, that is, are ordained for spiritual uses and ends, and not for civil or temporal, and therefore are outward notes and testimonies of those things that make us spiritual men, and they are parts of spiritual honour due unto spiritual authority and Lordship.

10. All spiritual Lords may claim as their due, spiritual worship, and therefore may institute religious Ceremonies: for look what difference there is between humane and divine, Temporal and Spiritual, the same difference there is between the peculiar worship due to the one, and to the other: if therefore Temporal Lords may require all civil rites and honors, Spiritual Lords may require all Divine and Spiritual Rites and honors.

11. Civil honor and reverence only, cannot nor ought not to please a *Spiritual Lord*, hence it is that the *Spiritual Lords* of our Church cannot content themselves with such honor that we give to civil Magistrates and Princes, but we must obey them in peculiar religious duties and services; and surely it is meet that if there be any such besides Christ, that we performe spiritual homage unto them, and they are not worthy that high style that will be content with temporalls, when spiritualls are due.

12. Those Ceremonies that are enjoined by true spiritual Lords, are truly spiritual and holy, even as spiritual and holy as the Sacraments, though they consist of some things in their own nature indifferent; and those Lords are not spiritual, that are not able

by their sole authority and word, to hallow that which before was not holy.

13. Those that can make a Surplice, a Cope, a Crosse, &c. to be ornaments of Religion and holy Ceremonies: can, when it pleaseth them, make a shaven Crown, a Monks habit, spittle in Baptism, holy Water, the triple Crown, and all the Missal Rites as holy. For they are all of the same nature: And those that can find no reason to prove those unholy and unlawful, would find none to prove any other external Rite to be so, if they should in the same manner be imposed.

14. Those that have power upon their own will and pleasure to bring into Gods Service some indifferent thing, may bring in any *indifferent thing: those that may bring in without special warrant from God, pyping into his Service, might as well bring in dancing also; those that have authority to joyn to the Sacrament of Baptism the sign of the Crosse, have authority also (no doubt) to joyn to the Sacrament of the Supper, Flesh, Broth, Butter or Cheese, and worse matters than those, if they will. Yea, those that have power to make peculiar forms of Religion and Worship, have power to make and invent a Religion and Worship of their own.

* For all indifferent things are of the same nature.

CHAP. VI.

Of Divine Worship in special, and first of true Worship.

THus much of Divine Worship in general, both Inward and Outward, and of Ceremonies, wherein Outward Worship especially consisteth. Now let us in special consider the same. Divine Worship therefore is either true Worship or false.

2. True Worship is that immediate service that the true God himself requireth to be performed unto himself. In the exercise whereof consisteth true holiness and Religion.

3. True Worship both for matter and manner, ought to be according to the prescript rule of Gods Word only: Neither hath any mortal man authority to frame according to his own conceit, any form or fashion of Gods Service and Worship; for the manner of Worship also must be holy, and not the matter only; and no man hath power to make any thing holy, that God hallowes not by his Word and Spirit.

4. All civil furtherances and necessary circumstances of Gods solemn Worship, though they be not essentiall parts of the same, nor by special Nomination commanded: Yet are they to be esteemed Ordinances of God, and not humane inventions. As God having ordained that his Saints dwelling together, both Men, Women and Children, of all sorts and degrees, should ordinarily at appointed times meet together, it must needs be presupposed to be his Ordinance that they meet together in some such ordinary places, as are fittest for to receive most commodiously such Assemblies: So God having ordained that his Ministers should preach or proclaim salvation to a multitude gathered together, and that they should sit at his feet, hath also ordained that the Ministers seat should be higher than the rest of the Peoples; and the like may be said of all other such Circumstances of Divine Worship, which are matters of so base and low consideration, and so subject to common sence, that it neither beseemeth the majesty of the Word of God in special, or humane authority derived from God, to make any Laws in particular about them; no more than to make Laws that one should not sit in the Congregation upon anothers lap, or one spit upon anothers cloaths, or face: or that men should not make antick faces in the Church.

CHAP. VII.

Of False Worship.

THus much of true Worship. False Worship is such a service of God as hath no warrant from God himself; Worship is false in matter or manner in whole or in part; neither can the true matter of Worship sanctifie a corrupt manner, or the true manner sanctifie a corrupt matter, or some parts of true Worship, or the whole it self, sanctifie any part of false Worship that shall be adjoyned to it, or mingled with it.

2. Whatsoever is unholy and superstitious out of Gods *solemn Service*, cannot be made by the sole appointment and will of man holy and good in the *solemn Service* of God, but must needs be more unholy and superstitious therein, and therefore a part of false Worship. If for a man to sign himself or another in the forehead with the *sign* of the *Cross* out of Baptism, be superstitious and unholy, it can-

not be good in Baptism, but a prophane rite.

3. The more light and toyish the things seem to be that without warrant from God, are brought into the Worship of God, the more we should abhor conformity unto them, it being a fearful presumption, to serve God in a toyish manner: for who is he that trembles at the Majesty of God, that dares use in his Worship any toy and trifle? They are deceived therefore that think that therefore we should not make scruple to use them because they are toyes.

4. That is a corrupt manner of Worship wherein there is confusion and undecency, for all things must be done in the Service of God in decency, order and comliness, as it is granted; and under the name whereof these Ceremonies are obtruded upon us: But those things that are undecent and disorderly in other matters, and of no necessary use in Gods Worship, cannot be matters of order and decency in the Service of God, except God himself should in a special manner command them.

5. It being therefore confusion and disorder in civil matters where a multitude joyns together in a common suit and supplication for all to speak at once the same words: And common wisdom and discretion having taught it to be a decent and orderly Ceremony, that some foreman should speak, and the rest hold their peace, giving only some sign and testimony of assent: He must be more than a man, that must make it an orderly thing in our general and ordinary suits and prayers to God, for all the Congregation to open their mouths together in a prayer, especially sith God hath in special appointed the Minister to be the mouth of the People, and expressely requireth the assent of the People only in the word, *Amen*.

6. It being a ridiculous disorder in other matters in any solemnity, where any Deed or Record is to be read or rehearsed, for one to read one period, and another read or say another; how can it by mans wit and will, without Ordinance from God, be a matter of order, for the Minister to read one verse of Scripture, and the People another; for the Minister to say one piece of a Prayer, and the People, by way of catch, to say another.

7. If any thing be undecent out of the Worship of God (the same reason of undecency remaining) it is much more undecent in the Worship of God; for the more excellent the thing is, in which an undecent thing is used, the more undecent the thing is that is so used. As if it be undecent to go naked in any company, it is much more

more undecent to go so in the Congregation: If foul apparel be every where else undecent, it cannot be decent in Gods Service, though all the Bishops in the world should decree it.

8. An undecent and disorderly thing the more strictly it is urged in the Service of God, the more dangerous it is to yield unto the same, and so much the more effectual cause of false Worship.

9. If there be some apparel that doth in special manner become the Service of God, and deserve: to be appropriated unto it, then by the same position there must be some apparel that doth deform and disgrace the Service and Worship of God: for if no apparel can deform it, then no apparel can be an ornament or decent form unto it.

10. If any apparel do deform Gods true Worship, it is that apparel that doth most beautifie and grace the false and Idolatrous worship of God: As that apparel must needs most deform a wise man that doth most adorn a fool, and that apparel must needs be most unbeseeming a King, that is seemly and decent for a beggar.

11. If therefore men would set their wits upon the highest strain to invent an apparel to disgrace the Ministers of the Gospel, they could not invent a more odious attire than the consecrated attire of a filthy Mass-Priest, the most abominable Idolater in the earth.

12. Those that abhor Idolatry as much as they do beggary and folly, cannot but hate and abhor the badges of Idolatry as much as the badges of folly and beggary, and therefore cannot but account that Priestly attire that is enjoyned unto us by our Prelates, an apparel more unbeseeming the Minister of the Gospel, than a Cloak with a thousand patches, or a coat with four elbows, for beggary and folly being judgements and not sins, the notes of beggary and folly cannot be so odious in a spiritual eye, as the notes of Idolatry.

13. If it be denied, that the apparel enjoyned is Popish, because it was before Popery was; this answer may be made. 1. It can never be proved that it was before Popery. For though not all Popery, yet some Popery was in the Apostles times: Most of the Heresies were before the full revealing of Antichrist, which notwithstanding we fasten upon them and count popish, they having entertained them. If therefore an errour, maintained before Popery, and retained by Papists, deserve the name of a popish errour, why should not unnecessary apparel, though used before, yet entertained now only by them, and those that receive it from them, bear the name

of

of Popish attire? 2. As a coat of divers colours is a fools coat, notwithstanding that *Joseph*, one of the twelve Patriarkes, wore one, so a white linnen garment is a popish garment, though some Ministers in the East Churches did wear them, and yet it can never be proved, that either they wore such a one as is prescribed unto us, or that it was a ministerial garment, and not their ordinary civil attire, or proper to the Minister only, or if all this, that it was well done; for there being no one Father that wrote since the Apostles times, but have erred in some matters of Doctrine, why may they not as well erre in matters of Ceremony; if all the true Churches of God, beside our own in *England*, and the greatest part of the sufficientest Pastors of our own Church, are held to erre in the generall renouncing of these Ceremonies; Why might not some few Ministers in the Old Church as well erre in instituting and using them?

14. A corrupt and scandalous Ceremony in the Worship of God is so much the more dangerous and scandalous to others, by how much the more it comes graced and countenanced with lawfull authority. A corrupt Ceremony enjoyned by a Heathenish Pagan and Tyrant unto the Ministers of the Gospel living under his jurisdiction, cannot do so much spiritual hurt, as when it shall be required by a Christian Magistrate, for the good conceit of the institutor and ordainor of a religious Rite, is it that breeds Superstition. Those therefore whose special calling from God is, to edifie the souls of men and not to destroy them, ought so much the more to avoid these Ceremonies they judge and know to be scandalous and hurtful to the souls of men, by how much the greater grace and countenance they receive from the Authority of man, neither can the commandment of the Magistrate be a sufficient plea at the bar of Gods Judgment Seat for a man that by vertue or force thereof alone, hath done any action (how indifferent soever in it self) that his conscience tels him will scandalize his brother, and so hurt his soul; grosse therefore is the Doctrine of them that teach, That *Paul* (if the Magistrate had commanded him) should have eaten flesh, though his brothers soul should have been damned for it.

15. The more indifferent an action is in it self, the more odious it ought to be unto us when we shall perceive it to hurt our brothers soul, which ought to be a thousand times dearer unto us than his body, or our own lives, for he shews neither love nor mercy to his brother, that had rather be the instrument of his everlasting damnation,

nation, than cause the doing of a meer indifferent thing, though he should incur therefore any bodily punishment whatsoever. That Form therefore of Gods Service that consists in the use of such things indifferent, as experience manifesteth, are a scandal (and by consequent a destruction) to the souls of infinite numbers, ought not to be used of any, much less of those who are called by Christ to feed the souls of men, and not to destroy them. How scandalous these Ceremonies are to all, how the omission of them cannot be scandalous to any, but unto such as are worse scandalized already by embracing them, requires a larger Treatise.

16. No Magistrate that is a Christian will challenge authority to destroy the soul of any man, and therefore he cannot upon his own meer will and pleasure, without sin against God, enjoyn any thing (not required by God) that evidently tendeth to the destruction of any mans soul; and those subjects that (being ready to perform any duty that God requireth unto the Magistrate) shall refuse to do any such thing so required, and shall patiently and meekly yield themselves to any punishment the Magistrate shall think good to lay upon them without resistance, shall * perform more true and loyal obedience unto his authority therein, then any of those that shall yield obedience to any Laws of that kind enacted by never so good a Magistrate, and (in shew) to never so good an end.

* A patient suffering, when we cannot in conscience obey, is the best obedience.

17. No subject therefore can take any such authority from the hands of the Magistrate, which may warrant him to do any thing that shall evidently destroy his brothers soul at any time, much less in the Service and Worship of God wherein all things that are to be done, ought to tend to the edification of his soul in a special manner.

18. It is plain in the Word of God, that the Kingdom of God, (that is) the Service and Worship of God, standeth not in meats and drinks, nor any such external Rites having no authority from God. When therefore without any commandment from God, such external things shall be brought into the Service of God, and made the very forms of the same; such Rites must needs be false Worship, and that form of Gods Service must needs be adulterate, that is made to consist in such things. For no authority can make that a part of Gods Kingdom, that the word of God doth expresly deny to be a part thereof.

19. Those Ceremonies therefore in present controversie being meerly by man brought into the Worship of God, are by no means

to

to be yielded unto, for it is in effect to make the Kingdom of God to consist in meats and drinks, or in such like things. For if man hath authority to make the Kingdom of God consist in apparel, &c. he hath also authority, if it please him, to make it consist in eating and drinking, and may make them a part of the Lyturgie, as well as any of those things that are in controversie.

20. Those peculiar Rites and Ceremonies which are in that manner and form used in the Service of God, that if God himself did but ratifie and confirm, that present use of them should then be parts of his true outward worship, must needs, as they are used, (without Gods Ordinance) be parts of a false outward worship: But our Surplices, Crosses, Kneeling at the Lords Supper, &c. are such, that if God should but command to use them as we use them, that is, if he should require every Minister in Divine Service to wear a Surplice, to note Joy, Dignity or Sanctity, or in Baptism to cross a child, in sign, &c. Nay, though he should express no use at all, but barely enjoyn the things themselves to be used in his Service, yet they should be parts of Gods true outward worship; for whatsoever God tieth in a peculiar manner to his worship, is a part thereof. These Ceremonies therefore, in controversie having such a use in the Service of God, unto which they are peculiarly tied, must needs be used as parts of Divine worship, for else the bare ratifying of their present use could not make them true worship; Being therefore (as they are used) parts of Divine Worship, and not parts of true Divine Worship, because not commanded of God; they are parts of false Divine VVorship, for that Divine VVorship that is not true VVorship, is false VVorship.

FINIS.

A TREATISE OF THE NATURE & USE OF Things Indifferent.

Tending to prove,

That the CEREMONIES in present Controversie amongst the Ministers of the Gospel in the Realm of *England*, are neither in Nature or Use Indifferent.

Joh. 18. 23.

If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: but if I have spoken well, why smitest thou me?

Mat. 5. 11.

Blessed are ye when men revile you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you for my sake falsely; Rejoyce and be glad, for great is your reward in heaven, for so persecuted they the Prophets that were before you.

Printed in the Year, 1660.

The Printer to the Reader.

A Copy of this Treatise by the providence of God coming into my hand, I thought it behoeful for my Country-men, that they should be made acquainted with it, that by means thereof they might receive some light of the truth for which so many suffer. The Author, whosoever he is, hath little cause to be offended with it; The pains he hath taken in it doth perswade me, that he cannot but desire the same in it self, though danger, and want of means, might hinder him from publishing it; But howsoever (good Reader) accept it as a Testimony of my Vows for the good of my Country, the Weal whereof shall ever possess me, though I cannot possess it.

Farewel.

A Treatise OF Things Indifferent.

CHAP. I.

Of Things Indifferent in general.

A Thing Indifferent (in the largest extent of sense) is any *Mean* between two *Extreams*.

2. *Extreams* (properly) are the uttermost bounds and limits of any thing, being in direct opposition one unto the other.

3. To be a *Mean* between two *Extreams*, is so to be seated between them, as that it stand equally affected to either, enclining no more to the one than to the other.

4. Hence the Latines call things indifferent, *Res mediæ* (middle matters) and that by reason of that analogy and proportion that is between them, and those things that in Physical or Mathematical Dimensions possesse the middle place in any line, figure or body: For, that is properly called the middle of any thing, that in position being as near as can be to both extreams, enclineth no more to the one than to the other, but is alike equally distant from both.

5. And they are therefore called *things indifferent*, because in their relation to those Extreams between which they are seated, and unto which they are referred, they stand indifferently disposed, and affected to either; whence of the *Greeks* they are called *Adiaphora*:

phora, unto which our English term doth precisely answer. For, as that is just the middle of a line, that leaveth on both sides so much to either extream, that there is in respect of it no difference between the one and the other; but unto it, both are equal and alike: So those things are called *Indifferent* properly, that without any difference, do equally agree unto, or dissent from those Extreams, unto which they have reference and relation.

6. By all this it may appear that things Indifferent, are not such simply in themselves and of themselves considered, but as they are compared and have relation to the said opposite extreams, as the Center in a circle, considered in it self and by it self, is not the middle of any thing, but only as it hath reference to the opposite extreams in the Circumference: from any of which it is equally distant, and in that respect only, is it called the *mean* or middle of such a figure.

7. The very essence therefore of a thing *indifferent*, consists in that equal and indifferent reference and relation that it hath to some two opposite terms or extreams, unto which either in sence or reason it is compared, and by which only it is measured. So that it is in the number of those things that in Schools are called Relatives, all which have only but an accidental being, the Subjects thereof being variable, according to the divers references and respects that they have unto divers things. For as a man simply considered in himself, is neither Husband, Father, nor Master, but only in respect of Wife, Child and Servant. And as the same man in divers respects may be a Father and a Son, a Master and a Servant: So nothing is in and of it self indifferent, but only in relation and reference to some opposite extreams: And those things which in some such respect may be indifferent, in some other respect may be Extreams.

CHAP. II.

Of things more commonly called indifferent.

1. THough *things Indifferent* may in that former generality, spread themselves to any mediocrity whatsoever: Yet Custom the Mistresse of all speech and language, hath restrained and limited the name to such things only, as are a *Mean* between

good and evil. So that (to omit what in rigorous propriety of speech may be comprehended under the name that is given unto them) In common use of speech, a thing indifferent is only any mediocrity between good and evil.

2. The proper Extreams therefore of things indifferent, being good and evil, they cannot (retaining the nature of their indifference) communicate or partake of either; for whatsoever standeth equally affected to good and evil, cannot in that affection, have in it either good or evil: It being impossible, that either of the extreams should be found in the *Mean*, without destruction of the nature thereof.

3. Whatsoever then void of all evil, [a] participateth but the least measure of good; or void of all good, partaketh but the [b] least degree of evil, cannot bear the name of a thing *indifferent*: for there can be no indifferency in that, which inclineth more to the one extream, than to the other.

4. A thing indifferent therefore being a *mean*, between good and evil, it is [c] so seated between them, that it is as far removed from good, as a thing not evil can be; and as far removed from evil as a thing not good can be, and as near unto good and evil, as any thing can be, that is neither good nor evil. So that whatsoever is Indifferent, is neither good nor evil, whatsoever is either good or evil, is not indifferent, whatsoever is not indifferent is either good or evil.

5. Things *Indifferent* being equally divided from good and evil, are in like manner divided from all the properties of either; For every property being unseparable from that subject, from the nature whereof it springeth, no one can be communicated to any thing, but unto that, unto which the subject it self communicateth it self: If therefore the property of any Extream be found in a thing Indifferent, the Extream it self is to be found likewise therein. Which to imagin, is as absurd, as to look to find the Circumference of a Circle in the Center.

6. No indifferent thing therefore as it is an indifferent thing, [d] hath power to make any thing good or evil, better or worse: For it is the property only of good and evil, either to make or increase good or evil in any thing.

7. That [e] which doth more hurt or good, than some things that are good or evil, is not indifferent, but either good or evil: for nothing but good can exceed in goodness that which is good; and nothing

[a] Such they say are our Ceremonies. For those things are good that are decent, orderly & means of edification.

[b] Such we say and have proved the Ceremonies to be.

[c] So are not these Ceremonies.

[d] But they say that the Ceremonies in controversie have. For that which is a grace and ornament to good, maketh the better.

[e] But such are the ceremonies in controversie.

nothing but evil, can exceed in hurt, that which is evil.

8. Whatsoever [f] worketh upon any affection of man, stirring up in him love, hatred, delight, sorrow, zeal, malice, envy, jealousie, hope, fear, &c. cannot be apprehended as a thing indifferent, by him in whom these passions are wrought. For it is the property only of those things that present themselves as good or evil, to beget and move such passions in the soul of man. For it is impossible that a thing indifferent apprehended as a thing indifferent, should beget any thing in the soul of man but Indifferency, and a Stoical apathy or senselessness: So that whatsoever a [g] man intirely loveth and delighteth in, admireth, commendeth, pursueth with zeal, commandeth with authority. Whatsoever also a man shall abhor, condemn, forbid, punish, persecute, he cannot in any sincerity affirm, that he judgeth that thing to be indifferent, but to be in some degree either good or evil.

9. The omission of that is indifferent, the commission whereof is indifferent: and that whose [h] omission is evil, is certainly good.

10. All the former Premises considered, this must needs follow, That [i] to command a thing indifferent, is to command no good; to forbid a thing indifferent, is to forbid no evil. [k] To do a thing indifferent, is to do no good: To forbear a thing indifferent [l] is to do no evil. And therefore to punish for a thing indifferent, is to punish for no evil.

f This do the ceremonies in controversie.
g As our Prelates do the ceremonies.
h Such is the omission of our ceremonies said to be, and that in a high degree.
i To command our ceremonies is to command as they say, a great good, yea a publick common good.
k But to use the ceremonies is to do much good, if they edify the soul.
l None are more spitefully intreated than those that forbear these ceremonies, and therefore sure therein they do much evil.

CHAP. III.

Of things Indifferent in Special.

1. THE Essence of things *Indifferent*, consisting in a meer and equal privation of Good and Evil, there cannot be given any true kinds or degrees of them: For all privatives considered in themselves, are of the same nature.

2. Though there be no true kinds of them, yet they may be varied according to the diversity of those Extreams with which they are compared: And therefore may be distinguished according to the common distinctions of good and evil.

3. That good that hath not an evil opposite unto it in the same kind, cannot be the Extream of any thing *Indifferent*, and therefore

cannot

cannot vary, distinguish, or denominate a thing indifferent. As, if there be not an opposite colour unto white, then it is impossible to imagine how white should be an extream to any other colour, or any other colour a mean unto it.

4. That which is properly a mean, must agree with the extreams in all things in which the extreams do agree: for Example, If black and white be both of them colours, that which is properly a mean between black and white must be a colour also; for it were absurd to call any thing but a colour, a mean between black and white: so that the mean followes the common natures and qualities of both the extreams, for as it is said before, That onely is a mean that is not only equally distant from two extreams, but withall is as neer to both as may be, which cannot be verified of that mean that shall not be found to agree with the extreams in those things wherein the extreams do agree within themselves, and therefore things indifferent follow their extreams. As therefore that cannot be an extream that hath not in the same kind an opposite, so that can be no *medium* to any extreams, that doth dissent from them in that wherein they shall accord and agree. So that that denomination and predication that belongs to both extreams, belongs also to their *mean*. The mean between two opposite Qualities is a quality; between two substances, a substance; between two actions an action; between two goods a good; between two evils an evil; between two quantities a quantity, *&c.*

5. Hence it will follow, that no [a] substance (as it is a substance) can be called a thing indifferent, because that there is no substance that is evil as it is a substance. For an indifferent substance, must needs (if there were any such) be a mean between a good and an evil substance. If then there be no evil substances, it cannot be imagined how there should be any indifferent.

[a] All substances therefore are indifferent only by accident, in respect of some use.

6. The like may be said of all [b] created species and kinds of things, considered not only in their substances, but qualities and dispositions. For the voice of God pronouncing them all to be good, none of them are evil: and if none of them be evil, none are indifferent. For indifferent created things can have no place, either real, or imaginative, but between a created good, and a created evil. There is therefore no Creature of God, nor no created property or quality of any creature, that is by creation a Thing Indifferent.

[b] As also of all artificial which imitate natures.

7. Also upon the said grounds it appears, that there is no absolute

absolute *Indifferent thing*, because there is nothing in nature either absolutely good, or absolutely evil: It being impossible that any thing should be an absolute *Mean*, whose extreams are not absolute, for where one extream is absolute, and the other not absolute, the Mean cannot be absolute; for if it be, it enclineth more to one extream than the other, which is to destroy the nature of a thing indifferent.

[a] And therefor there cannot be made an absolute and perpetual law concerning any thing, under the name of indifferent; for a law bindeth only to good, and punisheth for evil: and therefore to imagine a law that bindeth to the doing of a thing indifferent, when that thing indifferent turns evil, as the most indifferent thing may, then the force of the law ceaseth.

CHAP. IV.

Of the first Distinction of Things Indifferent.

1. THings Indifferent therefore, being to be distinguished according to those distinctions of Good and Evil that are equally common to them both, we are in the next place distinctly to propound the same, and by them accordingly to distinguish the other.

2. First therefore Good and Evil is such, either in appearance only, or indeed also. Whence ariseth the first distinction of *things indifferent*, for accordingly some things are indifferent in appearance only, some indeed.

3. A Thing indifferent in appearance only, is that which is a *mean* between that Good and Evil [a] that is in shew and appearance only. For that appeareth to be indifferent, that being good or evil indeed, appeareth or seemeth to be neither.

[a] Consider whether the mystical Rites of an Idolatrous Religion and Worship, be not at least an evil in appearance and shew, and therefore cannot be so much as in appearance indifferent.

4. A thing indifferent indeed, is that which is a Mean between those things that are in truth and verity Good or Evil. So that such an indifferent is void of all true good, [b] and evil.

[b] If our Ceremonies were such, the Devil and Antichrist, and all superstitious and blind persons would not so much dote upon them, and the hearts of so many learned and godly men would not burn against them as they do.

5. As that which is good in appearance only, is indeed either evil

evil or indifferent, and that which is evil in appearance only, is indeed either good or indifferent; and that which is indifferent in appearance only, is indeed either good or evil: So that which is indifferent indeed, is in truth, neither good nor evil.

6. As [c] the grosseſt evil may by means of ſome counterfeit or ſhadow caſt upon it, be in appearance the greateſt good, and the greateſt good may be diſguiſed, and in ſhew transformed into the greateſt evil: So with much more facility may either of them by the wit of man have caſt upon them the formes of things indifferent.

So that there muſt be ſpecial heed taken that we admit not of all things as indifferent indeed, that preſent themſelves to us under that name and ſhape: Florentines can diſguiſe and colour any thing; and it is now adayes the common exerciſe of the greateſt wits of the world to transforme Good into Evil, Evil into Good, and both into indifferent; ſo that in theſe dayes ſcant any thing is as it appears, or appears as it is.

[c] If Turciſme, Judaiſme, Paganiſme, and the groſeſt Idolatry that ever was amongſt the Heathen were eſtabliſhed by that law and authority that theſe Ceremonies are, any point or parcel thereof might

be maintained by the ſame or the like grounds, that *Mr. Hooker*, *Covel*, *wilkes*, maintain the Indifferency of theſe Ceremonies: And there is no Article of Faith and Religion, but (by the ſame method that the Surveyor uſeth againſt the Diſcipline of other Reformed Churches) it may be traduced and oppugned as moſt odious, groſſe, and impious.

CHAP. V.

The ſecond Diſtinction of Things Indifferent.

1. GOod and Evil is either *Internal* or *External*, according to which difference ariſeth a ſecond Diſtinction of *Things Indifferent*.

2. An *External Indifferent* is whatſoever hath in it neither outward *good* nor [a] *evil*.

3. An *Internal Indifferent*, is whatſoever hath in it neither inward *good* [b] nor *evil*.

4. Something [c] External Indifferent may have in it internal good or evil; and ſome things internally Indifferent may have in them outward Good or Evil.

[a] Some of our ſtate Divines think all external things indifferent: which ſhews that they that talk moſt of them, know leaſt what they are. [b] What inward hurt and evil is in theſe Ceremonies they beſt know, that are beſt acquainted with the ſtate of their flock. [c] The Doctors of *Oxford* ask what hurt can a wiſe man ſee in a ſquare Cap, and a Surplice? Indeed there is no outward hurt or evil in it; but it muſt be conſidered, whether there be not any inward hurt therein; for if it can be proved, that by them the ſoules of many are poyſoned with ſuperſtitious conceits, then it is apparent that they have inward hurt in them.

CHAP. VI.

Of the third distinction of Things Indifferent.

3. THirdly, Good and Evil is either of it self or by accident; which also make the 3 Distinction of things Indifferent.

2. An Indifferent by accident is a mean between those Extreams that are Good and Evil by accident, and not of themselves: for, that that needs be only accidentally indifferent, whose Extreams (by which it is limited and defined) are but accidentally Good or Evil: So that whatsoever is Indifferent only in relation of some accidental Good or Evil, is Indifferent not of it self, but by accident.

4. There is nothing so Good of it self, but it may be made Evil by accident; nothing so evil of it self but it may become good by accident: Nothing so good or evil but it may become indifferent by accident; nothing so indifferent of it self but it may become good or evil by accident.

5. Unto this head may be referred such things as are Indifferent by comparison; for, as there are some things good simply, that are evil in comparison, and some things evil simply, that are good in comparison; so also there is some good and evil, that in comparison with others is indifferent.

6. Ergo, There is nothing absolutely Indifferent (as our State dream) but by some circumstance of time, place, person, use, it may be either very good, or very evil.

If it can be proved that these Ceremonies are but evil by accident, they being not good of themselves, it is enough to argue that they are evil, and not indifferent. For, if many things that are good in themselves be to be forborne, when by some accident they do hurt, much more ought a thing indifferent when it hurteth, though but by accident.

CHAP. VII.

Of a fourth Distinction of things Indifferent.

1. THings are good or evil, either *Actively* or *Potentially*: So are also Things Indifferent.

2. A thing *Actually Indifferent*, is that which hath in it neither actual good nor hurt.

3. A thing *Potentially Indifferent*, is that which in act doth either hurt or good, though in possibility it may do neither.

4. There

There is nothing actually Indifferent but is potentially good or [a] evil: There is nothing potentially only indifferent, but it is actually either good or evil. Therefore there is nothing absolutely Indifferent.

[a] A possibility of evil in a thing indifferent, maketh it cannot do lesse doth on good, evil and worthy to be removed. A Nature reacheth to prevent evils, and a man in the prevention thereof, than to leave off a thing in it self indifferent, which and may do hurt.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the fifth Distinction of Things Indifferent.

1. LAstly, Good and Evil is either Corporall, in respect of the body; or Spiritual, in respect of the minde; In which respect Things Indifferent do alwayes vary.

2. A Thing Indifferent in respect of the body, is any such thing that applyed to the body, doth it neither good nor hurt. As that which maketh a man neither rich nor poor, strong nor weak, beautifull nor deformed, hungry nor yet satisfied, sick nor healthy, *&c.*

3. That may be Good [a] to the body in one respect, that is Evil in another, *& contrà*; and that may be indifferent unto it in one respect, that is good or evil in another: Also that may be good or evil to one part of the body that is indifferent to another part; And a thing may be indifferent to one, that is good or evil to another.

[a] Circumstances of time and place do also vary the things of this kind exceedingly. For that in some time, and some place, is indifferent to some body, that in another place, and at another time is good or evil.

4. A thing indifferent in respect of the *minde* or soul, is whatsoever having reference and relation to the soul, [b] doth it neither good nor hurt.

[b] Either indeed or appearance of it self, or accident, actually or potentially.

5. The Goods and Evils of soul, are either dispositions, qualities, or habits in the soul, or such actions as proceed from them, As thoughts, words, deeds; all which are called moral. A *Moral good* is whatsoever in Man or from man is agreeable and correspondent to the Law of Nature, Reason, or the Divine Law of God revealed supernaturally in his word; unto this head are to be referred, all true wisdom, knowledg, understanding, providence, discretion, and all actions flowing from the same: Also all Moral vertues, as, Justice, Temperance, Holiness, *&c.* with all the Actions proceeding from them, all which are squared and ruled by some or other of the

former Laws. A Moral evil is whatsoever is any waies repugnant (whether in general or particular) to any of those former Laws. As Ignorance, Folly, Injustice, Intemperance, &c. with all Actions proceeding from them.

6. Those things are in a Moral respect indifferent (whether they be Qualities, Inclinations, Habits or Actions) That have in them [c] neither *vertue nor vice*. Herein such Actions of mans will are most frequent, that are neither commanded nor forbidden in the Word of God.

[c] See chap. 8. sect. 4. marg.

7. There is no Action of mans will so indifferent [d] but the doing thereof (by some circumstance) may be repugnant to the Law of God, and by consequent be hurtful to the soul of man.

[d] So that (by Mr. *Hookers* favour) a man may by taking up a straw or a rush commit a Moral vice. For example, if he should use to do it in the time of prayer.

8. An Action that in some one respect unto some one special Law, is Indifferent, in respect of some other Law may be Good or Evil. As that action may be either Religious or Superstitious, that hath in it neither Temperancy nor Intemperancy.

9. Any action done by man that is not commanded [e] by God, either expresly or by direct consequent, that is a means either of it self or by accident of any hurt either to the body or soul of a mans self, or of his Neighbour, either by bringing evill into them, or nourishing or encreasing evill in them, cannot bear the name of an Indifferent action; For there is no indifferency in that, which being not required of God (and therefore is not Good) doth hurt (any waies) a man: which must needs be against the Law of God. For the sum of the Law of God being the love of God and our Neighbour, and love aiming only at the good of the loved: That action, that (besides the Law) doth any hurt to any, must either have an exception in the Law, or else be against it, and then it cannot be indifferent.

[e] Such are the Ceremonies in Controversie: They are no where in general or special commanded, no more then the shaven crown and holy water, and yet they have been and are the special means and occasion of the Schism of many hundred Brownists. Of much superstition in many thousand ignorant Protestants, and of confirmation of many infinites of wilful Papists in their Idolatry, as is most evident. Also, (if it be a sin to dislike our Lords spiritual) there is no one greater cause that moveth those that the prophane call Puritans to do it, then these Ceremonies, which if they might be freed from, as all other reformed Churches are, there is no other Civil obedience or subjection due unto them, that they would refuse to perform, in as low a degree as any other whatsoever.

10. Moral Actions, whether vertues or vices, respect either God immediatly, or our selves or our Neighbour, as is intimated before. So do also all indifferent Actions.

11. That

12. That Action is indifferent in respect of God, that doth neither advance nor obscure the glory of God: For this is the only good or Evil we can do unto God.

13. There is no Action (*f*) that a man can do by the power of his will, but either in it self, or by accident, it doth either glorifie or dishonour God, and therefore no action, in respect of God, is meerly and absolutely indifferent, but thereby God receiveth some honour or dishonour.

14. All Actions of Religion (amongst which (*g*) those are special that are peculiarly done in Divine Service) are (if they be as they ought to be) in a special manner good, tending more directly to the glory of God than any other Actions, therefore no Action of Religion, whether it be Moral or Ceremoniall, is indifferent, but either good or evil.

15. No Action of Religion, whether Moral or Ceremonial, (*h*) grounded only upon the will of man, and not upon the Word of God, can bring any special glory to God, and therefore no such Act can be an Act of Religion, but of Superstition, and therefore cannot be indifferent.

15. There being some mystical Ceremonies of Religion Good, and some Evil. If there be any mystical Ceremonies indifferent, they must then in some special and material point differ from the Evil, even as far as from the good. But there is no mystical Rite of Religion (*i*) but doth come many degrees nearer to the evil than to the good. And therefore there can be no mystical Rite of Religion indifferent.

16. An evil Ceremony of Religion being therefore only evil because it is forbidden of God: A good Ceremony of religion is therefore only a good Ceremony because it is commanded of God: and that must be an indifferent Ceremony that is neither forbidden nor commanded: But all Ceremonies in Religion that are not good, are evil, and therefore there are no indifferent Ceremonies of Religion.

17. As no man by his sole will can make that Ceremony good in Divine Worship that God forbiddeth to be done therein, or make that evil that God commandeth to be done therein. So can he not make that which is but indifferent to be good: For he cannot make that to be commanded of God that is forbidden of God; Or that which (though it be not forbidden) is not commanded: If therefore what Ceremony of Religion soever is good be commanded

f What honour receiveth God by our Ceremonies? It is certain that Antichrist receiveth great honour by them.

g Such are the Ceremonies and Rites that are peculiarly acted in Divine Worship, if they be good and lawful.

h Such are not Ceremonies else they are not indifferent.

i Crossing in Baptism being no more commanded, nor no less forbidden than their breathing upon the child, or anointing, which are rejected as evill, it must needs come nearer to these, than it doth to Baptism which is commanded.

manded of God; and if every Ceremony of Religion ought to be good, and if whatsoever Ceremony is commanded of God is not Indifferent, hence it will follow: That no Ceremony of Religion is indifferent.

18. Thus much of Actions indifferent having reference to God. Those actions of man are indifferent in respect of a mans self, or his neighbour, that being committed, bring neither moral hurt nor good unto himself, or them. For those actions are evill to the doer, and such as hurt his soul, that are a means of bringing either upon himself or upon his neighbour any evill forbidden. And those actions are good to his soul, that are a means of affecting with any good commanded himself or his neighbour.

19. Whatsoever therefore, doing a man no good, is a means either to (k) take from a man any good thing that God hath freely granted unto him, as Life, Health, Liberty, Name, honesty, Piety, &c. Or to bring upon a man that evil that God otherwise withholdeth from him, that cannot be indifferent.

20. All such humane Laws therefore, that (l) upon any penalties, bind men to those things that are confessed indifferent, which are such things as God hath left to the free liberty of man to do, or not to (m) do, is a depriving of men of that liberty that God hath granted unto them, and therefore such a Law is neither good nor indifferent, but evil to the soul of him that enacteth it, though not of him that obeyeth it. For it is no indifferency in any man to take that away from a man that God hath freely given unto him.

k But we shall be ready to prove, that such is the Law that requires these Ceremonies.

l Much more those Laws that lay greater penalties upon the omission of some Indifferent than the omission of the greatest good, or commission of the grossest evil, as do the Canons and Laws that require these Ceremonies.

m This hindereth not, but that the Magistrate may, and ought (if it be for the good of the Commonweal) command fish daies, and such like the neglect whereof may do much hurt, and the observation much good, for in such cases eating of fish and flesh is not a thing indifferent, but that which men stand bound either to forbear, or to do according to the Civil Laws of Magistrates.

21. All moral actions of men that are good or evill, are either private, or common and publike: The common and publike are either Domestical, Political, or Ecclesiastical. Actions also in their Indifferency may vary according to their divers references to these.

22. A private good or evil action, is that which affecteth with good or evill only a mans own person that doth it, and which spreadeth not to the good or hurt of any other (except secondarily and by accident) as he that eateth and drinketh) doth himself only good properly:

properly: Though secondarily and by accident, he may, in that strength he receiveth, thereby do his Family or the Commonwealth good.

23. That action is indifferent, in respect of a mans private self, that doth his own private Person any good or hurt.

24. Those Domestical, Political, Ecclesiastical actions are good or evil, that tend to the good or hurt of a Family, Commonwealth, or Church; and those are indifferent, that, being done, do bring neither good nor hurt, or as much good as hurt unto any of the said Societies.

25. That may be good, evil, or indifferent to a private person, as he is a private person, that is not so unto a Family, Commonwealth or Church, or unto him, as he is a member of all or any of them.

26. That may be Indifferent to be done by a Family, or the Commonwealth, as it is such, That is evil and not indifferent to be done by a Church. That may be indifferent to one member of a House, Church, or Commonwealth, that is not indifferent to another; that may be lawful or indifferent for the Church to do in one place, and at some one time, that is unlawful in another place, and at another time.

27. All which premises, or the most of them, being granted, it will easily appear, to any that can rightly apply these principles and general assertions, that the Ceremonies, in present controversie in our Church, are not (as is pretended by the forcers of them) meerly indifferent, but either excellent parts of our Religion, or notorious parts of Superstition.

FINIS.

Summa Summæ.

The Prelates to the afflicted Miniſters in this Realm.

Let them prove this aſſumption but by one Argument, and we will yield. But it is to be noted, That the Prelates ſtill take all things contained therein as granted and without queſtion, whereas we have proved and offer to prove the contrary.

ALL thoſe that wilfully refuſe to obey the King in things indifferent, and to conform themſelves to the Orders of the Church authorized by him, not contrary to the Word of God, are Schiſmaticks, enemies to the Kings Supremacy and State, and not to be tolerated in Church or Commonwealth.

But you do wilfully refuſe to obey the King in things indifferent, and to conforme your ſelves to the Orders of the Church, authorized by him not contrary to the Word of God. Ergo,

You are Schiſmaticks, Enemies to the Kings Supremacy and the State, and not to be tolerated in Church or Commonwealth.

The afflicted Miniſters to the Prelates.

ALL thoſe that freely and willingly perform unto the King and State all Obedience not only in things neceſſary, but *Indifferent*, commanded by Law; And that have been alwaies ready to conform themſelves to every Order of the Church, authorized by him, not contrary to the Word of God, are free from all Schiſm, Friends to the Kings Supremacy, and to the State, and unworthy in this manner to be moleſted in Church or Commonwealth.

(e) This Treatiſe, and other books lately written and exhibited to authority, do prove the Aſſumption.

But (e) there is none of us that is deprived or ſuſpended from our Miniſtry, but hath ever been ready, freely and willingly to perform unto the King and State all obedience, not only in things neceſſary, but Indifferent, required by Law, and to conform our ſelves to every Order of the Church, authorized by him, not contrary to the Word of God. *Ergo*,

We are all free from Schiſm, Friends, to the Kings Supremacy and the State, and moſt unworthy of ſuch moleſtation in Church and Commonwealth, as now we ſuſtain.

English Puritanism.

CONTAINING
THE MAIN OPINIONS
of the rigideſt ſort of thoſe that are called

PURITANS,

in the Realm of ENGLAND.

Acts 24. 14.

But this I confeſſe unto thee, that after the way (which they call hereſie) ſo worſhip I the God of my Fathers, believing all things which are written in the Law, and the Prophets.

Acts 28. 22.

But we will hear of thee what thou thinkeſt: for as concerning this ſect, we know that every where it is ſpoken againſt.

Printed in the Year, 1660.

To the Indifferent Reader.

IT cannot be unknown to them that know any thing, that those Christians in this Realm which are called by the odious and vile name of Puritans, are accused by the Prelates to the King's Majesty and the State, to maintain many absurd, erroneous, Schismatical, and Heretical Opinions, concerning Religion, Church-Government, and the Civil Magistracy. Which hath moved me to collect (as near as I could) the chiefest of them, and to send them naked to the view of all men, that they may see what is the worst that the worst of them hold. It is not my part to prove and justifie them: Those that accuse and condemn them must in all reason and equity prove their accusation, or else bear the name of unchristian Slanderers. I am not ignorant that they lay other Opinions (yea some clean contradictory to these) to the charge of these men, the falshood whereof we shall (it is to be doubted) have more and more occasion to detect. In the mean time all Enemies of Divine Truth shall find, that to obscure the same with Calumniations and untruths, is but to hide a fire with laying dry straw or tow upon it. But thou mayst herein observe, what a terrible Popedome and Primacy these rigid Presbyterians desire; and with what painted bug-bears and Scare-Crows, the Prelates go about to fright the States of this Kingdome withall, who will no doubt one day see, how their wisdoms are abused.

Farewell.

English Puritanism.

CHAP. I.

Concerning Religion, or the worship of God in general.

Imprimis, *They hold and maintain*, That the Word of God contained in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, is of absolute perfection, given by Christ the head of the Church, to be unto the same, the sole Canon and rule of all matters of *Religion*, and the worship and service of God whatsoever. And that whatsoever done in the same service and worship cannot be justified by the said word, is unlawfull. And therefore that it is a sin, to force any Christian to do any act of Religion or Divine service, that cannot evidently be warranted by the same.

2. *They hold* that all Ecclesiastical actions invented and devised by man, are utterly to be excluded out of the exercises of Religion; especially such actions as are famous and notorious Mysteries of an Idolatrous Religion: and in doing whereof, the true Religion is conformed (whether in whole or in part) to Idolatry and superstition.

3. *They hold* that all outward means instituted and set apart to expresse and set forth the Inward worship of God, are parts of Divine Worship, and that not only all moral actions but all typical rites and figures ordained to shadow forth in the solemn worship and service of God, any spiritual or religious act or habit in the mind of man, are special parts of the same: And therefore that every such act ought evidently to be prescribed by the Word of God,

or else ought not to be done; it being a sin to performe any other worship to God, whether External or Internal, Moral or Ceremonial, in whole or in part, then that which God himself requires in his word.

4. *They hold it*, to be grosse superstition, for any mortal man to institute and ordain as parts of Divine Worship, any mystical Rite and Ceremonie of Religion whatsoever, and to mingle the same with the Divine Rites and Mysteries of Gods Ordinance. But they hold it to be high presumption to institute and bring into Divine worship such Rites and Ceremonies of Religion, as are acknowledged to be no parts of Divine Worship at all, but only of Civil Worship and Honour: For they that shall require to have performed unto themselves a Ceremonial Obedience, Service, and worship, consisting in rites of religion to be done at that very instant that God is solemnly served and worshiped, and even in the same worship make both themselves and God also an Idol; so that they judge it a far more fearfull sin to add unto, and to use in the worship and service of God, or any part thereof, such mystical Rites and Ceremonies as they esteem to be no parts or parcells of Gods worship at all, than such as in a vain and ignorant superstition, they imagine and conceive to be parts thereof.

5. *They hold* that every act or action appropriated and set apart to divine service and worship, whether *moral* or *ceremonial*, real or typical, ought to bring special honour unto God; and therefore that every such act ought to be apparently commanded in the Word of God, either expresly, or by necessary consequent.

6. *They hold* that all actions, whether Moral or Ceremonial, appropriated to Religious or Spiritual Persons, functions, or actions, either are or ought to be Religious and Spiritual: And therefore either are or ought to be instituted immediately by God, who alone is the Author and Institutor of all Religious and Spiritual actions and things, whether Internal or External, Moral or Ceremonial.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Concerning the Church.

1. *They hold and maintain* that every Companie, Congregation, or Assembly of men, ordinarily joyning together in the true worship of God, is a true *visible Church* of Christ, and that the same title is improperly attributed to any other Convocations, Synods, Societies, combinations, or Assemblies whatsoever.

2. *They hold* that all such Churches or Congregations, communicating after that manner together, in divine worship, are in all Ecclesiastical matters equal, and of the same power and authority; and that by the Word and will of God they ought to have the same spiritual Priviledges, Prerogatives, Officers, Administrations, Orders, and Formes of Divine worship.

3. *They hold* that Christ Jesus hath not subjected any Church or Congregation of his, to any other superior Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, than unto that which is within it self: So that if a whole Church or Congregation shall erre, in any matters of faith or Religion, no other Churches, or spiritual Church-Officers have (by any warrant from the Word of God) power to censure, punish, or controle the same; but are only to counsel and advise the same, and so to leave their soules to the immediate judgment of Christ, and their bodies to the sword and power of the Civil Magistrate, who alone upon earth hath power to punish a whole Church or Congregation.

4. *They hold* that every established Church or Congregation ought to have her own spiritual officers & ministers, resident with her, & those such as are injoyned by Christ in the New Testament, and no other.

5. *They hold* that every established Church ought (as a special prerogative by which she is indowed by Christ) to have power and liberty to elect and chuse their own spiritual and Ecclesiastical Officers; and that it is a greater wrong to have any such forced upon them against their wills, than if they should force upon men wives, and upon women husbands against their will and liking.

6. *They hold* that if in this choice any particular Churches shall erre, that none upon earth but the Civil Magistrate hath power to controle or correct them for it: And that though it be not lawfull for him to take away this power from them, yet, when they or any of them shall apparently abuse the same, he stands bound by the Law of God, and by vertue of his Office (grounded upon the same,)

to

to punish them severely for it, and to force them under civil mulcts to make better choice.

7. *They hold* that the Ecclesiastical Officers and Ministers of one Church ought not to bear any Ecclesiastical Office in another, but ought to be tyed unto that Congregation of which they are members, and by which they are elected into office: And they are not, (without just cause, and such as may be approved by the Congregation) to forsake their Callings; wherein if the Congregation shall be perverse, and will not hearken to reason, They are then to crave the assistance and help of the Civil Magistrate, who alone hath power, and who ought by his Civil Sword, and Authority, procure to all Members of the Church, whether their Governors, or others, freedome from all manifest injuries and wrongs.

8. *They hold* that the Congregation having once made choice of their spiritual Officers, unto whom they commit the Regiment of their Soules, they ought not (without just cause, and that which is apparently warrantable by the Word of God) to discharge, deprive, or depose them; but ought to live in all Canonical obedience and subjection unto them, agreeable to the Word of God: And if by permission of the Civil Magistrate, they shall by other Ecclesiastical Officers, be suspended, or deprived, for any cause in their apprehension good and justifiable by the Word of God, then they hold it the bounden duty of the Congregation to be continual suppliants to God, and humble suters unto Civil Authority for the restauration of them unto their Administrations, which if it cannot be obtained, yet this much honour they are to give unto them, as to acknowledge them to the death, their spiritual Guides and Governors, though they be rigorously deprived of their Ministry and Service.

9. *They hold* that though one Church is not to differ from another, in any Spiritual, Ecclesiastical, or Religious matters whatsoever, but are to be equal and alike; yet, that they may differ, and one excel another in outward Civil Circumstances, of place, time, Person, *&c.* So that although they hold that those Congregations of which Kings and Nobles make themselves members, ought to have the same Ecclesiastical Officers, Ministry, worship, Sacraments, Ceremonies, and Forme of Divine Worship, that the basest Congregation in the Country hath, and no other; yet they hold also, That as their Persons in civil respects excel, so in the Exercises

of

of Religion in civil matters they may excel other Assemblies, Their Chappels and Seats may be gorgeously set forth, with rich Arras and Tapestry, their Fonts may be of Silver, their Communion Tables of Ivory, and if they will, covered with gold; the Cup out of which they drink the Sacramental blood of Christ may be of beaten gold set about with Diamonds; their Ministers may be clothed in silk and velvet, so themselves will maintain them in that manner; otherwise, they think it absurd and against common reason, that other base and Inferior Congregations must by Ecclesiastical Tithes and Oblations, maintain the silken and velvet suits, and Lordly retinue of the Ministers, and Ecclesiastical Officers of Princes and Nobles.

10. *They hold* that the Lawes, Orders, and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction of the visible Churches of Christ, if they be lawfull and warrantable by the Word of God, are no wayes repugnant to any Civil State whatsoever; whether Monarchical, Aristocratical, or Democratical, but do tend to the further establishing and advancing of the Rights and Prerogatives of all and every of them: And they renounce and abhor from their soules all such Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction or Policy, that is any way repugnant and derogatory to any of them, especially to the Monarchical State, which they acknowledg to be the best kind of Civil Government for this Kingdome.

11. *They hold and believe*, that the equality in Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and authority, of Churches and Church-Ministers, is no more derogatory and repugnant to the State and glory of a Monarch, than the Paritie or equality of Schoolmasters of several Schools, Captains of several Camps, Shepherds of several flocks of sheep, or Masters of several Families, yea they hold the clean contrary, that inequality of Churches, and Church-Officers in Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Authority, was that principally that advanced Antichrist unto his throne, and brought the Kings and Princes of the earth unto such vassallage under him; and that the Civil Authority and glory of Secular Princes and States hath ever decayed, and withered, the more that the Ecclesiastical Officers of the Church have been advanced and lifted up in authority, beyond the limits and confines that Christ in his word hath prescribed unto them.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the Ministers of the Word.

1. *They hold* that the Pastors of particular Congregations are, or ought to be the highest Spiritual Officers in the Church, over whom, (by any Divine Ordinance) there is no superiour Pastor but only Jesus Christ: And that they are led by the spirit of Antichrist, that arrogate or take upon themselves to be Pastors of Pastors.

2. *They hold* that there are not by any Divine Institution in the word, any ordinary, National, Provincial, or Diocesan Pastors or Ministers under which the Pastors of particular Congregations are to be subject, as Inferior Officers. And that if there were any such, that then the Word of God would have set them down more distinctly and precisely than any of the rest: For the higher place that one occupieth in the Church, of the more necessity he is unto the Church; of the more necessity he is to the Church, the more carefully would Christ (the head of the Church) have been in pointing him out, and distinguishing him from other. Hence, in the Old Testament, the High Priest, his Title, Office, Function and special Administration and Jurisdiction is more particularly and precisely set down, than the Office of any of the Inferior Priests and Levites. Also in the New Testament, the Office of a Pastor is more distinctly, and more precisely set down, than of a Doctor, or any other inferior Church-Officer: So that a man may as well call into question the whole New Testament, as doubt whether there ought to be a Pastor in every Congregation, or doubt of his proper Office and Function. And if by Gods Ordinance there should be an ordinary Ecclesiastical Officer above the Pastors of particular congregations, than Christ out of all question would with that special care and cost have set it forth, by Titles, prerogatives, peculiar Offices, Functions, and Gifts, that the Churches and people of God should have reason rather to doubt of any Office or Jurisdiction, than of the peculiar office or Jurisdiction of the Primates, Metropolitanes, Arch-Bishops and Prelates of the world.

3. *They hold* that if there were a supream, National, Ecclesiastical Minister or Pastor, that should be the Prince of many thousand

Pastors,

Pastors, that then also Christ (as he did in the Jewish Church) would have appointed a solemn National or Provincial Liturgy or worship, unto which at sometimes of the year, the whole body of the people should ascend, and that unto the Metropolitan City, as unto *Jerusalem*; and that he would (as he did in the Jewish Church) more precisely and particularly have set down the manner of solemnization thereof, than of his parochial worship: Forasmuch therefore as they cannot read in the New Testament of any higher or more solemn worship, than of that which is to be performed in a particular Congregation, they cannot be perswaded, that God hath appointed any higher Ministers of his service and worship under the New Testament, than the elect Ministers of particular Congregations.

4. *They hold* that the High Priest of the Jews, was typically and in a figure, the supream head of the whole Catholique Church, which though it were visible only in the Province and Nation of *Jury*, yet those of other Nations and Countries (as appears by the History of *Acts*, even though they were Ethiopians,) were under this High Priest, and acknowledged homage unto him. So that he was not a Provincial Metropolitane, but in very deed, an Oecumenical and universal Bishop of the whole world. And therefore they hold, (this being the best ground in the word, for Metropolitane and Provincial Pastors or Bishops,) that the Pope of *Rome*, who alone maketh claim unto, and is in possession of the like universal Supremacy, hath more warrant in the Word of God, to the same, than any Metropolitane or Diocesan (not dependant upon him) hath or can have. So that they hold, that by the Word of God, either there must be no Metropolitanes and Diocesans, or else there must be a Pope.

5. *They hold* That no Pastor ought to exercise or accept of any Civil publique Jurisdiction and authority, but ought to be wholly imployed in spiritual Offices and Duties to that Congregation over which he is set. And that those Civil Magistrates weaken their own Supremacy, that shall suffer any Ecclesiastical Pastor to exercise any Civil Jurisdiction within their Realms, Dominions, or Seigniories.

6. *They hold*, that the higheſt and supream Office and authority of the Pastor, is to preach the Gospel solemnly and publickly to the Congregation, by interpreting the written Word of God, and applying the same by exhortation and reproof unto them. They

[illegible] told, that this was the greatest work that Christ and his Apostles did: and that whosoever is thought worthy and fit to exercise this authority, cannot be thought unfit and unworthy to exercise any other Spiritual or Ecclesiastical authority whatsoever.

7. *They hold* that the Pastor or Minister of the Word, is not to teach any Doctrine unto the Church, grounded upon his own judgment or opinion, or upon the judgment or opinion of any or all the men in the world; but only that truth that he is able to demonstrate and prove evidently, and apparently, by the Word of God soundly interpreted; and that the people are not bound to believe any Doctrine of Religion or Divinity whatsoever, upon any ground whatsoever, except it be apparently justified by the Word, or by necessary consequent deduced from the same.

8. *They hold* that in interpreting the Scriptures, and opening the sence of them, he ought to follow those Rules only that are followed in finding out the meaning of other writings, to wit, by weighing the propriety of the tongue wherein they are written, by weighing the Circumstance of the place, by comparing one place with another, and by considering what is properly spoken and what tropically or figuratively. And they hold it unlawfull for the Pastor to obtrude upon his people a sence of any part of the Divine Word, for which he hath no other ground but the bare testimonies of men; and that it is better for the people to be content to be ignorant of the meaning of such [illegible] places, than to hang their Faith in any manner in this case upon the bare Testimony of man.

9. *They hold* that the people of God ought not to acknowledge any such for their Pastors, as are not able by Preaching, to interpret and apply the Word of God unto them, in manner and forme aforesaid: And therefore that no ignorant and [illegible] Priests are to be reputed the Ministers of Jesus Christ, who feadeth none into his Ministry and service, but such as he adorneth in some measure with spiritual gifts. And they cannot be perswaded that the faculty of reading in ones Mother tongue the Scriptures, &c. which any ordinary Turk of Infidel hath, can be called in any congruity of speech, a Ministerial gift of Christ.

10. *They hold* that in the Assembly of the Church, the Pastor only is to be the mouth of the Congregation to God in Prayer, and that the people are only to returne their assent by the word *Amen*. And that it is a Babylonian confusion, for the Pastor to say one piece

of

of a Prayer, and the people with mingled voices to say another; except in singing, which by the very ordinance and instinct of nature, is more delightfull, and effectual, the more voices there are joyned and mingled together in harmony and consent.

11. *They hold* that the Church hath no authority to impose upon her Pastors or any other of her Officers, any other ministerial Duties, Offices, Functions, Actions or Ceremonies, either in Divine worship or out of the same, then what Christ himself in the Scriptures hath imposed upon them, or what they might lawfully impose upon Christ himself, if he were in person upon the earth, and did exercise a Ministerial Office in some Church.

12. *They hold* that it is as great an injury to force a Congregation or Church to maintain as their Pastor, with Tithes, and such like Donations, that person that either is not able to instruct them, or that refuseth in his own person ordinarily to do it, as to force a man to maintain one for his wife, that either is not a woman, or that refuseth in her own person to do the duties of a wife unto him.

13. *They hold* that by Gods Ordinance there should be also in every Church, a Doctor, whose special office should be to instruct, by way of Catechizing, the Ignorant of the Congregation (and that particularly) in the main grounds and Principles of Religion.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the Elders.

1. FOrasmuch, as through the malice of Sathan, there are and will be in the best Churches many disorders and scandalls committed, that redound to the reproach of the Gospel, and are a stumbling block to many, both without and within the Church; and sith they judge it repugnant to the Word of God, that any Minister should be a sole Ruler, and as it were a Pope, so much as in one Parish, (much more that he should be one over a whole Diocesse, Province, or Nation) they hold that by Gods Ordinance the Congregation should make choice of other Officers, as Assistants unto the Ministers in the spiritual regiment of the Congregation, who are

by office, jointly with the Ministers of the Word, to be as Monitors and Overseers of the manners and conversation of all the Congregation, and one of another; that so every one may be more wary of their wayes, and that the Pastors and Doctors may better attend to Prayer and Doctrine, and by their means may be made better acquainted with the estate of the people, when others eyes besides there own shall wake and watch over them.

2. *They hold* that such only are to be chosen to this Office, as are the gravest, honestest, discreetest, best grounded in Religion, and the ancientest Professors thereof in the Congregation, such as the whole Congregation do approve of, and respect, for their wisdome, holinesse, and honesty, and such also (if it be possible) as are of civil note and respect in the world, and able (without any burden to the Church) to maintain themselves, either by their Lands, or any other honest Civil Trade of life: Neither do they think it so much disgrace to the policy of the Church, that Tradesmen and Artificers, (endowed with such qualities as are above specified) should be admitted to be Overseers of the Church, as it is that persons both ignorant of Religion and all good letters, and in all respects for person, quality, and face, as base and vile as the baseſt in the Congregation, should be admitted to be Pastors and Teachers of a Congregation. And if it be apparent that God (who always blesseth his own Ordinances) doth often, even in the eyes of Kings, and Nobles, make honourable the Ministers and Pastors of his Churches, upon which he hath bestowed spiritual Gifts and Graces, though for birth, education, presence, outward estate and maintenance, they be most base and contemptible; so he will as well in the eyes of all holy men, make this Office which is many degrees inferior to the other, precious, and Honourable, even for the Divine Calling and Ordinance sake.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the Censures of the Church.

1. *They hold* that the spiritual keyes of the Church are by Christ, committed to the aforesaid spiritual Officers and Governors, and unto none other: which keyes they hold that they

they are not to be put to this use, to lock up the Crowns, Swords, or Scepters of Princes and Civil States, or the Civil Rights, Prerogatives, and Immunities, of Civil Subjects in the things of this Life, or to use them as picklocks to open withal mens Treasuries and Coffers, or as keyes of Prisons, to shut up the bodies of men; for they think that such a Power and Authority Ecclesiastical is fit only for the Antichrist of *Rome*, and the consecrated Governours of his Synagogues, who having no Word of God, which is the Sword of the Spirit, to defend his and their usurped Jurisdiction over the Christian-World, doth unlawfully usurp the lawful Civil Sword and Power of the Monarchs and Princes of the Earth, thereby forcing men to subject themselves to his spiritual vassalage and Service, and abusing thereby the spiritual Keyes and Jurisdiction of the Church.

2. They hold that by vertue of these Keyes, they are not to make any curious Inquisitions into the secret or hidden vices or crimes of men, exorting from them a confession of those faults that are concealed from themselves and others: or to proceed to molest any man upon secret suggestions, private suspition, or uncertain fame, or for such crimes as are in question whether they be crimes or no; But they are to proceed only against evident and apparent crimes, such as are either granted to be such of all civil honest men: or of all true Christians, or at least such, as they are able, by evidence of the Word of God, to convince to be sins to the conscience of the Offender; As also, such as have been either publikely committed, or having been committed in secret, are by some good means brought to light, and which the delinquent denying, they are able by honest and sufficient testimony to prove against him.

3. *They hold*, that when he that hath committed a scandalous crime cometh before them, and is convinced of the same, they ought not (after the manner of our Ecclesiastical Courts) scorn, deride, taunt and revile him with odious and contumelious speeches; eye him with big and fiern looks, procure Proctors to make Personal Invectives against him, make him dance attendance from Court day to Court day, and from Term to Term, frowning at him in presence, and laughing at him behind his back: but they are (though he be never so obstinate and perverse) to use him brotherly, not giving the least personal reproaches, or threats, (but laying open unto him the nature of his sin by the light of Gods Word) are only by denouncing the judgements of God against him, to terrifie him, and so to move him to repentance.

4. *They*

4. *They hold*, that if the party offending be their civil Superiour, that then they are to use, even throughout the whole carriage of their Censure, all civil Complements, Offices and Reverence due unto him; That they are not to presume to convent him before them, but are themselves to go in all civil and humble manner unto him, to stand bare before him, to bow unto him, to give him all civil Titles belonging unto him; and, if he be a King and Supream Ruler, they are to kneel down before him, and in the humblest manner to censure his faults, so that he may see apparently that they are not carried with the least spice of malice against his Person, but only with zeal for the health and salvation of his soul.

5. *They hold*, that the Ecclesiastical Officers, laying to the charge of any man any Error, Heresie, or false Opinion whatsoever, do stand bound themselves, first, to prove that he holdeth such an error or heresie; and secondly, to prove directly unto him that it is an error by the Word of God, and that it deserveth such a censure, before they do proceed against him.

6. *They hold*, that the Governours of the Church ought with all patience and mildness hear what every Offender can possibly say for himself, either for Qualification, Defence, Apology, or Justification of any supposed crime or error whatsoever; and they ought not to proceed to censure the greatest offence that is, unless the Offender have said as much for himself in his defence as he possibly is able. And they hold it an evident Character of a corrupt Ecclesiastical Government, if so be the parties convented may not have full liberty to speak for themselves, considering, that the more liberty is granted to speak in a bad cause, (especially before those that are in Authority, and of judgment,) the more the iniquity of it will appear, and the more the Justice of their Sentence will shine.

7. *They hold*, that the Oath *ex officio*, whereby Popish and English Ecclesiastical Governours, either upon some secret informations, or suggestions, or private suspitions, go about to bind mens consciences to accuse themselves and their friends of such crimes or imputations as cannot by any direct course of Law be proved against them, and whereby they are drawn to be instruments of many heavy crosses upon themselves and their friends, and that often for those actions that they are perswaded in their consciences are good and holy; (I say) that they hold that such an Oath (on the urgers part) is most damnable and tyrannous, against the very Law of Nature, devised by Antichrist, through the inspiration of the devil, that by means

might either in their weakness, by perjury, damn their own souls, or be drawn to reveal to the Enemies of Christianity, those secret religious acts and deeds, that being (in the perswasion of their consciences) for the advancement of the Gospel, will be a means of heavy sentences of condemnation against themselves and their deerest friends.

8. *They hold*, that Ecclesiastical Officers have no power to proceed in Censure against any Crime of any Person, after that he shall freely acknowledge the same, and profess his hearty penitency for it: And that they may not, for any crime whatsoever, lay any bodily or pecuniary mulct upon them, or impose upon them any Ceremonial Mark or Note of shame, such as is the white sheet, or any such like; or take any fees for any cause whatsoever, but are to accept of, as a sufficient satisfaction, a private submission and acknowledgment, if the Crime be private, and a publike, if the crime be publike and notorious.

9. *They hold*, that if a Member of the Church be obstinate, and shew no signs and tokens of repentance of that crime, that they by evidence of Scripture have convinced to be a crime, that then by their Ecclesiastical Authority they are to deny unto him the Sacrament of the Supper. And if the suspension from it will not humble him, then (though not without humbling themselves in prayer, fasting, and great demonstration of fervent for him) they are to denounce him to be as yet no member of the Kingdom of Heaven, and of that Congregation, and so are to leave him to God and the King. And this is all the Ecclesiastical Authority and Jurisdiction that any Spiritual Officers of the Church are to use against any man, for the greatest crime that can be committed.

10. *They hold*, that the Officers of the Church are not to proceed unto the extreamest Censure against any man, without the free consent of the whole Congregation it self.

11. *They hold*, that the Minister, or any other particular Officer, offending, is as subject to these Censures, as any other of the Congregation.

12. *They hold*, that if any Member of the Congregation, having committed a scandalous sin, shall of himself forsake the Worship of God, and the Spiritual Communion with the Church, that then the Ecclesiastical Officers have no authority or jurisdiction over him,

but

4. *They hold*, that if the party offending be their civil Superiour, that then they are to use, even throughout the whole carriage of their Censure, all civil Complements, Offices and Reverence due unto him; That they are not to presume to convent him before them, but are themselves to go in all civil and humble manner unto him, to stand bare before him, to bow unto him, to give him all civil Titles belonging unto him; and, if he be a King and Supream Ruler, they are to kneel down before him, and in the humblest manner to censure his faults, so that he may see apparently that they are not carried with the least spice of malice against his Person, but only with zeal of the health and salvation of his soul.

5. *They hold*, that the Ecclesiastical Officers, laying to the charge of any man any Errour, Heresie, or false Opinion whatsoever, do stand bound themselves, first, to prove that he holdeth such an errour or heresie; and secondly, to prove directly unto him that it is an errour by the Word of God, and that it deserveth such a censure, before they do proceed against him.

6. *They hold*, that the Governours of the Church ought with all patience and quietness hear what every Offender can possibly say for himself, either for Qualification, Defence, Apology, or Justification of any supposed crime or errour whatsoever; and they ought not to proceed to censure the grossest offence that is, until the Offender have said as much for himself in his defence as he possibly is able. And they hold it an evident Character of a corrupt Ecclesiastical Government, where the parties convened may not have full liberty to speak for themselves, considering, that the more liberty is granted to speak in a bad cause, (especially before those that are in Authority, and of judgment,) the more the iniquity of it will appear, and the more the Justice of their Sentence will shine.

7. *They hold*, that the Oath ex officio, whereby Papish and English Ecclesiastical Governours, either upon some secret informations, or suggestions, or private suspitions, go about to bind mens consciences to accuse themselves and their friends of such crimes or imputations as cannot by any direct course of Law be proved against them, and whereby they are drawn to be instruments of many heavy crosses upon themselves and their friends, and that often for those Actions that they are perswaded in their consciences are good and holy; (I say) that they hold that such an Oath (on the urgers part) is most damnable and tyrannous, against the very Law of Nature, devised by Antichrist, through the inspiration of the devil, that by

means

[illegible] thereof, the professors and practizers of the True Religion, might either in their weakness, by perjury, damn their own souls, or be drawn to reveal to the Enemies of Christianity, those secret religious acts and deeds, that being (in the perswasion of their consciences) for the advancement of the Gospel, will be a means of heavy sentences of condemnation against themselves and their dearest friends.

8. *They hold*, that Ecclesiastical Officers have no power to proceed in Censure against any Crime of any Person, after that he shall freely acknowledge the same, and profess his hearty penitency for it: And that they may not, for any crime whatsoever, lay any bodily or pecuniary mulct upon them, or impose upon them any Ceremonial Mark or Note of shame, such as is the white sheet, or any such like; or take any fees for any cause whatsoever, but are to accept of, as a sufficient satisfaction, a private submission and acknowledgment, if the Crime be private, and a publike, if the crime be publike and notorious.

9. *They hold*, that if a Member of the Church be obstinate, and shew no signs and tokens of repentance of that crime, that they by evidence of Scripture have convinced to be a crime, that then by their Ecclesiastical Authority they are to deny unto him the Sacrament of the Supper. And if the suspension from it will not humble him, then (though not without humbling themselves in prayer, fasting, and great demonstration of sorrow for him) they are to denounce him to be as yet no member of the Kingdom of Heaven, and of that Congregation, and so are to leave him to God and the King. And this is all the Ecclesiastical Authority and Jurisdiction that any spiritual Officers of the Church are to use against any man, for the greatest crime that can be committed.

10. *They hold*, that the Officers of the Church are not to proceed unto the extreamest Censure against any man, without the free consent of the whole Congregation it self.

11. *They hold*, that the Minister, or any other particular Officer, offending, is as subject to these Censures, as any other of the Congregation.

12. *They hold*, that if any Member of the Congregation, having committed a scandalous sin, shall of himself forsake the Worship of God, and the Spiritual Communion with the Church, that then the Ecclesiastical Officers have no authority or jurisdiction over him,

but

but only the Civil Magistrate, and those unto whom he oweth Civil subjection, as Parents, Masters, Landlords, &c.

CHAP. VI.

Concerning the Civil Magistrate.

1. *They hold*, that the Civil Magistrate, as he is a Civil Magistrate hath, and ought to have Supream power over all the Churches within his Dominions, in all causes whatsoever; and yet they hold, that as he is a Christian, he is a Member of some one particular Congregation, and ought to be as subject to the spiritual Regiment thereof prescribed by Christ in his Word, as the meanest subject in the Kingdom; and they hold, that this Subjection is no more derogatory to his Supremacy, than the Subjection of his body in sickness to Physitians, can be said to be derogatory thereunto.

2. *They hold*, that those Civill Magistrates are the greatest Enemies to their own Supremacie, that in whole or in part, communicate the virtue and power thereof to any Ecclesiastical Officers. And that there cannot be imagined by the wit of man a more direct means to check-mate the same, than to make them Lords and Princes upon Earth, to invest them with Civil Jurisdiction and Authority, and to conform the state and limits of the Jurisdiction to the State of Kings, and bounds of Kingdoms.

3. *They hold*, that there should be no Ecclesiastical Officer in the Church so high, but that he ought to be subject unto, and punishable by the meanest Civil Officer in a Kingdom, City, or Town, not only for common crimes, but even for the abuse of their Ecclesiastical Offices; yea, they hold, that they ought to be more punishable than any other Subject whatsoever, if they shall offend against either Civil or Ecclesiastical Laws.

4. *They hold*, that the Civil Magistrate is to punish with all severity the Ecclesiastical Officers of Churches, if they shall intrude upon the rights and prerogatives of the Civil Authority, and Magistracy, and shall pass those bounds and limits that Christ hath prescribed unto them in his Word.

5. *They hold*, that the Pope is that Antichrist, and therefore that Antichrist, because being but an Ecclesiastical Officer, he doth in the

the height of the pride of his heart make claim unto, and usurp the Supremacy of the Kings and Civil Rulers of the Earth. And they hold, that all defenders of the Popish Faith, all endeavours of reconcilement with that Church, all plotters for tolleration of the Popish Religion, all countenancers and maintainers of Seminary Priests and professed Catholicks, and all deniers that the Pope is that Antichrist, are secret enemies to the Kings Supremacy.

6. *They hold*, that all Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans, Officials, *&c.* have their Offices and Functions only by will and pleasure of the King and Civil States of this Realm; and they hold, that whosoever holdeth that the King may not, without sin, remove these Offices out of the Church, and dispose of their Temporalities and maintenance according to his own pleasure, or that these Offices are *Jure Divino*, and not only or meerly *Jure humano*: That all such deny a principal part of the Kings Supremacy.

7. *They hold*, that not one of these Opinions can be proved to be contrary to the Word of God, and that if they might have leave, that they are able to answer all that hath been written against any one of them.

FINIS.

TWELVE General Arguments,

Proving that the

CEREMONIES

Impoſed upon the Miniſters of the Goſpel in *England*, by our Prelates, are unlawful;

And therefore,

That the Miniſters of the Goſpel, for the bare and ſole omiſſion of them in Churh-Service, for conſcience ſake, are moſt unjuſtly charged of diſloyalty to His

MAJESTIE.

Mat. 18. 23.

If I have ſpoken evil, bear witneſs of the evill: but if I have ſpoken well, why ſmiteſt thou me?

Printed in the Year, 1660.

To the Reader.

GOod Reader, We come not as Voluntaries into this field of Contention, but dragg'd into it by the very hairs of our head: If our cause be righteous and good, Thou wilt easily grant (in so great Imputations and Extremities inflicted upon us for the same) that we can do no less than give reasons for our selves and it. All the favour I require of thee, is, That thou wouldst look into our cause (not by the flashing lightnings that come out of the mouths of our Adversaries the Prelates) but by the light of our own Reasons, by which, if thou shalt see the goodness of our cause, and innocency of our persons, than embrace it with us, and in pity pray for us, that (without shipwrack of Faith and a good Conscience) we may endure patiently and meekly, whatsoever God shall suffer to be inflicted upon us for the same, in these wicked and licentious times.

THE

THE FIRST ARGUMENT.

All Will-Worship is sin.
To use these Ceremonies in Church-Service, in manner and form prescribed, is a Will-Worship. Ergo,
To use them is sin.

THE Proposition cannot be denied, for the Apostle *Paul* plainly condemneth Will-Worship.
The Assumption may thus be proved:

All parts of Divine Service and Worship, imposed only by the will and pleasure of Man upon the Ministers of Divine Service, and that of necessity to be done, is Will-Worship.
But to use these Ceremonies in manner and form prescribed, is to use such Ceremonies as are 1. *Parts of Divine Service and Worship.* 2. *Imposed only by the pleasure and will of Men, upon the Ministers of Divine Service.* 3. *Of necessity to be done therein.* Ergo,
To use these Ceremonies in manner and form prescribed, is a Will-Worship.

The Proposition is as clear as the Sun at noon-day.
The Assumption hath three parts:
1. That they are parts of Divine Worship and Service.
This is proved evidently by this Argument:

All Mystical and Ecclesiastical Rites and formes of Divine Service, instituted by Ecclesiastical authority, to be Ministerial actions in the

the ſolemn Worſhip of God, and performed in that manner, and having that uſe in Divine Service, that if God ſhould but ratifie and confirm the ſame uſe, they ſhould then be parts of his true Worſhip; (I ſay) all ſuch Ceremonies are uſed as parts of Divine Worſhip.

But theſe Ceremonies in controverſie, are either all, or the greateſt part of them ſuch. Ergo,

They are parts of Divine Worſhip and Service.

The Propoſition cannot with any modeſt face be denied; For elſe how could a ſole Divine ratification of the preſent uſe of them make them parts of his true Worſhip? If they were not uſed as parts of his Worſhip before.

The Aſſumption is as manifeſt: For if Chriſt ſhould by ſome Revelation from heaven ſignifie, That it is his will that a Miniſter in Divine Service ſhould wear a white linnen garment, in Baptiſm make the ſign of a Croſs, to theſe ends and purpoſes that are expreſſed in the Service Book, then certainly they ſhould be eſſential parts of his Divine Worſhip, elſe the Jewiſh Rites and Ceremonies and our Sacraments are no parts thereof.

The ſecond part of the Aſſumption of the firſt Syllogiſm.

That they are impoſed only upon the pleaſure and will of man.

This is evident: For thoſe things that God leaves as indifferent to the will and diſcretion of man to do, or leave undone, being impoſed by man upon man, are impoſed only upon the will and pleaſure of man.

The third part of the Aſſumption is:

That they are of neceſſity to be done in Divine Service.

Which is alſo out of all doubt; For a Miniſter ſtands bound to do them upon pain of ſuſpenſion and deprivation: And God muſt have no ſolemn Worſhip in *England*, except it be adminiſtred in the ſame.

Upon all this it follows:

That to uſe theſe Ceremonies in manner and form preſcribed, is to uſe ſuch Ceremonies as are parts of Divine Worſhip, impoſed only by the will of Man, &c.

The

The Second Argument.

It is a sin against God, for him that is by way of Excellency a servant of Jesus Christ, (without a precise and direct warrant from him) at any time (especially in the Solemn Worship of God) to give special honour to Antichrist and his members.

But to use these Ceremonies, is in that manner aforesaid, to give special honour to Antichrist and his members. Ergo,

It is a sin against God to use them.

THE Proposition is manifest and clear to any that have an eye of Reason and any light of Divinity shining in it: For what is a sin if this be not: That a Servant of Jesus Christ, even then when he is in the Service of Christ, should perform special honour and service to Antichrist, or any of his Limbs.

The Assumption is proved (if our Adversaries will grant it, that the Pope is Antichrist, and that all the visible members of his Church, acknowledging him their supream head, are members of him) by this reason.

Such a Conformity to Antichrist and his members in the Ceremonies of Religion and Form of Divine Worship, as is not only besides the Word of God, but in a special manner derogatory to all reformed Churches that have departed from the Synagogue of Rome, *is a special honour to Antichrist and his members.*

But to use these Ceremonies in Divine Worship, is such a Conformity to Antichrist and his members. Ergo.

To use these Ceremonies, in that manner aforesaid, is to give special honour to Antichrist and his Members.

The Proposition is without exception: For if it should be a special honour to the Bishops of *England* and their conformed Clergy, for the Churches of *Scotland*, voluntarily to leave conformity to the Churches of the Low Countries, *France*, and *Germany*, and to conform themselves in Ceremonies and Form of Divine Worship to the Prelatical Clergy of *England*: It must needs be a special honour to Antichrist and his Members, for any to do the like to them.

The

The Assumption is thus proved;

For a Minister of Jesus Christ to conforme himself in such peculiar Rites, Ceremonies and Formes of Divine Service, to Antichrist and his members, as other reformed Churches have rejected for vain, foolish, and superstitious, is in a special manner derogatory to all other reformed Churches.

But to use these Ceremonies in controversie, is in that manner to conforme himself. Ergo,

It is in a special manner derogatory to all other Reformed Churches.

Both parts of the Syllogisme are such as may easily be proved, if they be denyed.

The 3. Argument.

All Worship more than Civill, performed to any besides God, is a sin.

To use these Ceremonies in manner and forme prescribed, is to performe a more than civil honour (even a Religious) only to a humane Power and Authority;

Ergo,

To use these Ceremonies is a sin.

THe Proposition needs no proof: For there is no middle Honor between Civil and Divine; and therefore that which is more than Civil, is Divine. Now Divine Honor is to be given only to God, who will not have his Glory given unto another.

The Assumption is thus proved;

If these Ceremonies be Religious Ceremonies, and all Religious Ceremonies be a part of Divine worship, performed to that authority that instituteth and commandeth them. If also the authority that instituteth and commandeth them is but meerly humane, Then the Assumption is true.

But the first is true: Ergo, *The latter is true also.*

The Proposition cannot be denyed of any reasonable creature.

The Assumption hath three Parts:

I. That

I. *That these Ceremonies are Religious Ceremonies.*

This needs no proof: For what shall we make to be Religious Ceremonies, if those Ceremonies be not that are prescribed by the Church, to the Church only, tied to Religion only, and Religious Functions, Offices, and Persons; to be acted and performed only in Exercises of Religion and Divine Worship, and are mystical shadowes and types of Religious Doctrine?

II. *That all Religious Ceremonies are parts of Divine Worship.*

This neither should need any proof: If those that are adversaries unto us in this cause, did not too much presume of the weakness of our Discourse, and the strength of their own wit. For there being an external Divine Worship, which properly consists in the outward Rites and Ceremonies of Religion: What Ceremonies can be called parts thereof, if such Religious Ceremonies as these be not? For if bowing the knee, *&c.* in Divine Worship, (though it be used also in Civil Worship) be a part of Divine Worship, much more are those Ceremonies that are peculiarly appropriated to Divine Service and Worship, and wherein part of the forme thereof is made to consist. But it may (for further satisfying of men) be thus proved:

All meer and immediate Actions of Religion are parts of Divine Worship.

All Religious Ceremonies are meer and immediate Actions of Religion:
Ergo, *They are parts of Divine Worship.*

Further, How can a man imagine that a meer Religious Ecclesiastical Act, done by a Servant of God in the solemn Service and Worship of God, by precise Canon of the Church, should be no part of Divine Worship, sith all the solemn Rites and Ceremonies that are used in the solemn Services of Civil States, (especially such as are done in their presence) have been ever reputed parts of civil Honor and Worship.

Lastly, Considering that God in his Divine Worship doth require the whole heart, and all the powers of the Soul during the act of his Worship, It were great presumption for any mortal Creature to prescribe any Action to man during the same Act that is no part thereof: considering that every Action so prescribed must of necessity pull a part of the heart from Divine Worship.

III. *That Authority that inſtituted them is humanly known.*

This is moſt certain, for if they were inſtituted by Divine authority, they could not be eſteemed matters indifferent; and ſhould not be in the power and diſcretion of the Magiſtrate to diſanull them.

The fourth Argument.

If it be lawfull for a Miniſter of the Goſpel without ſin to uſe theſe Ceremonies in Divine Worſhip; it is lawfull for him upon the ſame occaſion to uſe any Jewiſh, Turkiſh, Paganiſh, or Popiſh Ceremony whatſoever.

But it is not lawfull for the Miniſter of the Goſpel to uſe in Divine Worſhip, upon the ſame occaſion, any Jewiſh, Popiſh, Paganiſh, or Turkiſh Ceremony.

Ergo, *He cannot without ſin uſe theſe.*

THe Aſſumption cannot for ſhame be denied, We prove the conſequent of the Propoſition.

If any Jewiſh, Turkiſh, Paganiſh, or Popiſh Ceremonies and Rite be a thing in its own nature as indifferent as theſe Ceremonies are, and either have, or may have by ſuch like inſtitution as good uſe, then the conſequent of the Propoſition is true.

But the firſt is true, Ergo, *The latter is true alſo.*

The Propoſition, as I think, cannot be denied, nor the Aſſumption, but by bringing ſome contrary inſtance in ſome of their Ceremonies: When any ſuch ſhall be given, this Argument ſhall be further proſecuted.

The

The fifth Argument.

Every schismatical Action done by a Minister of the Gospel is a sin.
To use these Ceremonies in controversie are schismaticall Actions.
Ergo, *To use these Ceremonies is sin.*

THe Proposition will be granted: I must prove the Assumption.

All actions of irregularity and non-conformity to the Catholique Church wherein we live, are schismatical Actions.
To use these Ceremonies in controversie, are actions of irregularity, and non-conformity to the Catholique Church wherein we live.
Ergo, *The use of these Ceremonies in controversie are schismatical Actions.*

The Proposition cannot be denied; for if we be branded with the cole of schisme justly, for denying conformity in some Ceremonies, but to some of our own particular Churches wherein we live, though we be content to join with them that use them in Divine Worship: much more Schismaticks are they that are not conformable in Rites and Ceremonies, to the Catholick Church wherein they live.

I prove the Assumption:

If all the Protestants, Pastors, Ministers, and Governors, living this day in Europe, *and all the painfull resident Pastors of our own Country, (except some non-resident Idol-shepherds, some that depend upon the Prelacie, and some other that are forced and constrained to use them against their will) do not only refuse to use these Ceremonies, but esteem them vain, foolish, and superstitious: Then the use of these Ceremonies are actions of irregularity, and non-conformity to the Catholique Church.*
But the first will be proved true; Ergo, *The latter is true also.*

The Proposition is evident, by their own Principles: For an irregularity and non-Conformity to the Pastors and Governors of

Church: is an irregularity and non-Conformity to the Church, for they are reputed the *CHURCH-REPRESENTATIVE:* and if they be to be anathematized, and excommunicated, that deny the bishops and other ministers assembled in the convocation, to be the Church of *England* representative, then surely are all the Pastors of the visible Churches in *Europe*, the Catholique Church representative, and those particular Ministers in this Realm, that shall use not only different Ceremonies, but such as they have renounced and forsaken, are Schismaticks and irregular persons.

The Assumption is evident in it self.

The sixth Argument.

All spiritual Communion with these Idolaters amongst whom we live in the mysteries of their Idolatry and Superstition, is sin.

To use these Ceremonies in Divine worship, is a spiritual Communion with the Idolatrous Papists (that do not only border round about us, but are tollerated in infinite numbers to live amongst us) in the mysteries of their Idolatry and Superstition. Ergo,

To use these Ceremonies is to sin.

The Proposition is his M. own, if Master B. have made a true report of the Conference at *Hamp.* Court; for therein his Ma. confesseth, That if we lived among Idolaters, we ought not then to communicate with them in their Rites and Ceremonies.

The Assumpion is thus proved:

If Papists be Idolaters, if we be not only in league with whole Kingdoms of Papists bordering upon us, and near unto us, but have many thousand professed ones living amongst us: if these Ceremonies be special mysteries of their Superstition: if to use the same Rites that they do in theirs, in our spiritual and divine Service, be spiritually to communicate with them in the same: then is the Sentence of the Assumpion true.

But we shall be able to prove, as soon as any shall deny, that the first, and every part and parcel thereof is true. Ergo,

The later is true also.

The

The seventh Argument.

To Mingle Prophane things with Divine, is to sin.
To use these Ceremonies in Divine Worship, is to mingle Prophane things with Divine: Ergo,
To use these Ceremonies in Divine Worship is to sin.

THe Proposition shineth in the eyes of the very Heathen, who have esteemed it a dishonour to their Religion and Worship, that any prophane persons should be Actors in it, much more that any prophane Actions should be mingled with it.

The Assumption is thus proved.

All peculiar Actions done in Divine Worship, that are neither Civil nor holy, are prophane.
These Ceremonies are peculiar actions, done in Divine worship, that are neither civil nor holy: Ergo,
They are prophane.

The Proposition cannot with any shew of reason be denied, there being no mean between these in such actions as are prescribed to be done in Divine Service, by Canon and Law; For though spitting, coughing, hemming, &c. if they be used for necessity, be neither civil, holy, nor prophane actions; yet if there should be an Ecclesiastical Canon that should require the Minister to spit at every full period, or the people to hem, and hauk, at every transition in a Sermon, they must needs then be referred to one of these three heads, as shall easily be proved if it be denied.

The assumption is as clear:

For first, His Ma. (with words of great disgrace and contempt of those that hold the contrary,) hath lately protested that they are not urged as holy and Religious matters; And that they are not civil Actions, hath been proved before; for there being an opposition in Reason between things *Civil and Ecclesiastical*, though they have some things common

to both (as all Oppofites have) yet it is ridiculous to affirm, that thofe things are civil, that are meerly Eccleſiaſtical, and are Actions peculiarly appropriated, and tied to Divine Worſhip: For civil Actions are performed in civil Affairs; & though there is a common civility alſo to be obſerved even in Divine matters, yet thoſe Actions cannot be called Civil, that are uſed only in Divine Offices and duties; no more than thoſe can be called Eccleſiaſtical and Divine that are uſed only in Civil affairs. For, it may be affirmed by as good reaſon, that an Eccleſiaſtical Officer, employed only in Eccleſiaſtical matters, is a Civil Officer only: Or a Civil Officer employed only in Civil matters, is an Eccleſiaſtical Officer only; as that a meer Eccleſiaſtical action, done in and by the Church only, ſhould be a Civil Action.

The eighth Argument.

If it be lawful to uſe theſe Ceremonies in Divine Worſhip, it is therefore lawful, becauſe they are either lawful in themſelves, or being things in their own nature indifferent, are made lawful by the commandment of the Magiſtrate to be uſed in Divine Service.

But they are neither lawful in themſelves to be uſed, nor therefore lawful becauſe the Magiſtrate commands them ſo to be uſed, though they be Matters in their own Nature indifferent. Ergo,

They are unlawful to be uſed in Divine Worſhip.

THE Propoſition I think cannot be denied, when it is, I hope it may be proved.

The firſt part of the Aſſumption is clear: For if they were in themſelves lawful to be uſed, then might a Miniſter of the Goſpel, being left to his own diſcretion by the Magiſtrate, invent, inſtitute, and uſe the like Ceremonies in the ſame manner without ſin. For any man, left to himſelf, may lawfully do that which of it ſelf is Lawful and indifferent. But a Miniſter ſhould ſin againſt God, if he ſhould of his own head inſtitute and uſe the like Ceremonies to thoſe, though permitted by the Magiſtrate; except we ſhould hold, that it is lawful for a Miniſter to do any indifferent thing in Gods Service, for a man may of any indifferent thing make a Ceremony like unto one of theſe.

The

The second part of the Assumption is thus proved:

If they be therefore lawful, because, being thing in their own nature different, the Magistrate commands them to be done in Divine Service: Then whatsoever thing (being in its own nature indifferent) is, or shall be commanded by the Magistrate, is lawful to be done in Divine Service.

But all things that are in themselves matters indifferent, are not lawful to be done in Divine Service, though the Magistrate should command them. Ergo,

They are not therefore lawful to be used in Divine Service, because the Magistrate commands them, though they be things in their own nature indifferent.

The Proposition cannot be denied: For if some things, indifferent in their own nature, being commanded by the Magistrate, are unlawful, it can be no good Argument to say, These things, being indifferent, are commanded by the Magistrate. *Ergo,*

They may lawfully be done. Much less therefore they ought to be done. Or as the Doctors of *Oxf.* affirm, that they bind the conscience.

The Assumption is more clear than the Proposition. If it be considered either what things are indifferent indeed, or go under the name and title of indifferent things. Eating and drinking, the avoiding the superfluities of Nature; due benevolence between Man and Wife; spinning and carding; killing of Oxen and Sheep, *&c.* which of themselves have in them neither vertue nor vice, are therefore indifferent Actions; and yet I think none, except professed Atheists, but will hold it a foul sin to do some of these Actions in any Assembly, much more in the solemn Worship of God, though the Magistrate should command the same even upon pain of death. But if it be further considered, That Carding and Dicing, Masking and Dancing; for Men to put on Womens apparel, and Women Mens; Drinking to healths; Ribald, Stage-plaies, *&c.* are things indifferent to be done even upon the Lords own day: May a Minister of the Gospel, upon the Magistrates commandment, do any of these in Divine Worship? And yet there is none of these but may have applied unto them, by the Wit of Man, a Mystical and

Religious

Religious fence; and then by this Bishop of *Canterburies* Rule, They must needs be good and lawful Ceremonies: for his principal Argument to prove them lawfull at his last Convention of *London* Ministers before him, was this:

They are Ceremonies that teach good Doctrine,
Ergo,
They are good Ceremonies.

Whereas the filthiest actions and things that are may teach good Doctrine: The Holy Ghost resembleth the soul polluted with sin to a menstrous cloth: A man fallen again into sin, to a Sow wallowing in the mire: might therefore a filthie Sow, and such unclean Clothes, be brought into the Church, to be visible shadowes, and representations of such things? Nay, What may not by this means be brought into Gods Worship, and yet by this reason be defended to be a good Ceremony, if the Magistrates and Bishops should decree the same? A fools coat and a beggers, worne in Divine Service, may fitly teach this Doctrine, *Not many Wise, Not many Noble:* A Minister clothed in such apparrel as those that act the Devils part in a play may teach this, That by nature we are limbs of Sathan, and firebrands of Hell: Men might wear Womens apparel, and Women mens; The one to teach, That the Church is Christs Wife; The other to teach, that Women in Christ are equall to Men. Bear-baiting may teach us, How Christ was baited before the Tribunalls of the Pharisees, or the combate between the flesh and the spirit. But the grossenes of these Assertions will appear in our Special Reasons against the Ceremonies in particular.

The

The Ninth Argument.

To administer unto the Church of God Sacraments that are not of Divine Institution, is to sin.

To use divers of these Ceremonies, viz. *The Cross in Baptism, the Ring in Marriage, the Surplice,* &c. *is to administer unto the Church of God Sacraments that are not of Divine institution.* Ergo,

To use these Ceremonies, is to sin.

THE Proposition is granted of all, both Papist and Protestant.

The Assumption is thus proved:

All mystical bodily Rites and Signs of spiritual grace, administred to the Church of God, in his solemn Service, to confirm Grace, and that by him that represents the Person of Christ, are Sacraments.

The greatest part of these Ceremonies in controversie are such, and not of any divine Institution. Ergo,

To use them, is to administer Sacraments that are not of Divine Institution.

The Proposition is most evident, and cannot be denied of any that bears the face of a Divine.

The Assumption is as evident, only this one clause may be doubted of: Whether these Ceremonies be administred to confirm Grace, which is thus proved:

Those Ceremonies that are administred to edifie the soul and consciences, are administred to confirm Grace.

These Ceremonies are administred to edifie the soul and conscience. Ergo,

They are administred to confirm Grace.

The Proposition cannot with any colour be excepted against: For to edifie the soul, to confirm Grace in the soul, and to feed the soul, are equivalent.

The Sacrament of the Supper therefore being, for this only cause a Sacrament, because it is a mystical Rite, whereby the soul spiritually feedeth upon Christ, *i. e.* is edified in Christ: These being Mystical Rites also, whereby the soul is edified, which it cannot be, but also by feeding upon Christ; It must needs follow, That these Ceremonies are Sacraments.

The Assumption is their own, for when they are urged with this, That all things must be done to edification, They all hold with one consent, That they do edifie.

The tenth Argument.

It is a sin against Christ the sole Head of the Church, for any one of his Ministers, (especially in the administration of Divine things) either by Word or Signs, solemnly to profess and acknowledge a spiritual homage to an usurped spiritual authority in the Church.

But to use these controverted Ceremonies in manner and form prescribed, is even in the solemn Service of Christ, by solemn Signs to acknowledge a spiritual homage to the spiritual authority of Lord Archbishops and Bishops, which is usurped. Ergo,

It is a sin to use these Ceremonies.

THE Proposition may not be gainsaid: For all spiritual power usurped over the Churches of God, is an Antichristian authority; and to profess spiritual homage thereunto, is to profess spiritual homage unto Antichrist, which must needs be a sin.

The Assumption hath two parts:

1. *That these Ceremonies are an acknowledging by solemn signs a spiritual Homage to the spiritual authority of Archbishops and Bishops.*

Which is most evident; for it having been proved before, that they are meer Ecclesiastical, Religious and spiritual Actions, enjoyned by an Ecclesiastical and spiritual authority, They must needs be Signs of spiritual homage to the same authority. For either the doing of a Religious and spiritual Action, in obedience to a spiritual authority, is a Sign of spiritual homage, or no Actions can be a Sign thereof. As therefore a Serving man, being a civil person, upon

the Bishops pleasure, wearing a Tawny Coat, and a Chain of Gold, holding up his Train, going bare-headed before him, holding a Trencher at his Table, lighting him to the house of Office, dressing his meat, rubbing his Horses, &c. doth by these Actions, as it were by solemn Signs, acknowledge Civil homage to him, being a Civil Lord and Master: So a Minister of the Gospel, and a Pastor of a particular Congregation, being by his Office a meer spiritual man; being commanded by the Bishop, as he is a spiritual Lord and Master over the Church of God, to wear a Tipper, a square Cap, a Priests Gown and Cloak, a Surplice; to make Crosses upon childrens faces; to put Rings on Brides fingers, &c. and all this in their Divine Service: I say, a Minister doth thereby give solemn Signs and Tokens of spiritual homage to their spiritual Lordships; even as by preaching the Word and administration of Sacraments and Prayer, he professeth by solemn Signs a spiritual homage to the spiritual authority of Christ.

If they shall peremptorily affirm, That they are only Civil matters (as some in high place have done to my self) then this will follow of it: Whereas the Bishops command now Ministers to wear a Surplice, a Priests Cloak, &c. he may command them to wear Tawny Coats, and livery Cloaks, and in their courses to wait and attend upon him, as serving Creatures: For there is no more Civil Authority shewed in requiring the one than the other, if the one as well as the other be Civil matters. Neither will it help their cause, that the Magistrate requireth these things to be done: For the Magistrate commanding Ecclesiastical matters to be done, his commandment doth no more make them Civil, than his commanding the Sacraments, and other parts of Divine Worship, to be administred duly, doth make them Civil matters. For the ratification by Civil authority the Constitutions of Ecclesiastical authority, doth no more make them Civil matters, than the ratification and confirmation of Civil matters by Ecclesiastical authority doth make them Ecclesiastical or spiritual matters. Though therefore there is none of us that stand out in these matters, but have ever been content to yield unto their Lordships all Civil honour, such as is given to Barons, Earls, Dukes, and Princes; yet, except they were Gods and Christs, we have no reason to give spiritual homage unto them; which is it that in very deed they require in these things: And therefore hence it comes to pass, That as they turn out of their Palaces those Servants that refuse their Liveries, and to do their civil

Services: So, as though they were Lords and Masters in the Church, they turn the Ministers out of their Offices, and shut them out of the Church, if they refuse to wear their spiritual Liveries, and to do them spiritual and religious Service. But I come to the second part of the Assumption.

2. *That the authority of our Lord Archbishops and Bishops, is an usurped authority.*

This is sufficiently proved of late by Mai. *Jacob* in his L. Assertion by many reasons, only because the weight of the Argument leaneth upon it, I will use one Reason.

Those Officers and Rulers in the Church, that make claims to be of Divine Institution, challenge to themselves Apostolical authority and jurisdiction, as the only Successors of the Apostles, to sit only in Moses *Chair; To have sole power of the Keys; To cut from the visible Church, and receive again; To have power of creating and displacing all other Ecclesiastical Officers; To be the Universal Pastors of whole Dukedoms and Kingdoms, under whom all other Pastors are as Curates, &c. And yet for all this, are such as stand and are supported only by humane Traditions and Ceremonies, such as a Civil Magistrate may, without sin, put out of the Church; and such as the true Churches of God may renounce (and yet continue the true Church) as Antichristian Usurpers and spiritual Tyrants. (I say) all such Officers and Rulers exercise a usurped authority in the Church:*

But our Archbishops and Bishops are such Rulers and Officers as are aforesaid. Ergo,

They execute a usurped power over the Church.

The Proposition may easily be justified: For if inferiour Officers, *viz.* Pastors of particular Congregations have had, and may have firm continuance in the Church without these humane devises and inventions; If the Magistrate cannot, without sin, put them out of the Church; And if those can be no true Churches that renounce to have particular Pastors and Ministers over them, it must much more hold in such Church-Officers and Rulers as these are, if their authority be lawful and good: For whilest the Apostles lived, they needed not any humane Traditions and devices to support their authority; the Magistrates that sought to put them down sinned

with a high hand: And that was no Church that renounced and disclaimed their Office, Authority, and Jurisdiction.

The Assumption is as easily justified: For 1. They make claim and title to all those Prerogatives before rehearsed in the first part of the Proposition, and unto more than that, as shall be proved if it be denied. 2. It is an Emblem of their own, *NO CEREMONY, NO BISHOP.* Ergo, *No humane Tradition and Invention, no Bishop. Ergo,* The Office of a Bishop is supported by them, either only or specially. 3. Their Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction is derived from the King, else it is a flat denial of his Supremacy. Also, themselves grant in their last Tables of Discipline, That the King hath power to encrease or diminish the Circuit of a Bishopprick: That he may make two or more Bishoppricks of one, and one Bishopprick to be two or more: Yea, what should hinder, but that he may devide the Bishopprick of *London* into eight hundred. For, where God hath not defined the number of Parishes that a Bishop is to raign over, it must needs be a thing indifferent: In which, by their own Doctrines, the King hath authority, without sin, to dispose. If therefore the King may as well (notwithstanding any thing in the Law of God) Give the Keys of the Church to every particular Pastour of a Congregation, over his own Congregation, as to a Bishop over a Dioces, which taketh away the very Essence of an English Bishop; He may, without sin, take away the very Office of the Bishop, which consists in having Jurisdiction over many Congregations. Also, it being not defined, by the Word of God, but left free, what attire Bishops shall wear, as also, what maintenance they shall have; The King, having absolute power in things indifferent, according to their own Doctrine, He may turn them out of their Rochets and Parliament Robes; Thrust them out of their Pallace; and put them to their stipends, to live upon voluntary devotions of poor Christian People, and then a man may easily imagine what the Office of a Bishop would be worth: For, he that hath authority to prescribe to a Bishop, and other Ministers, the Forms, Rites, and Ceremonies of their Divine Service, hath also power much more, to prescribe, moderate, and appoint their Apparel, Diet, and manner of maintenance. So that it is clear, That the King may, without sin, disanul the Authorities, Dignities, and Prerogatives of Bishops; Any of which shall be (if it be denied) proved to be matters of greater indifferency, and therefore more appertaining to his Supremacy, than the prescribing of Forms of Divine Service,

and.

and mystical Rites of Religion. For let the King take from the Bishop all indifferent things (which he may do by their own Doctrine) and a Bishop will be no Bishop, as shall be proved, if it be denied. 4. There is no true and sober Christians but will say, that the Churches of *Scotland*, *France*, the Low-Countries, and other places (that renounce such Archbishops and Bishops (as ours are) as Anticristian and usurping Prelates) are true Churches of God: which they could not be, if the Authority and Prerogatives they claim to themselves, were of Christ, and not usurped. For if it were the Ordinance of Christ Jesus, That in every Kingdome, that receiveth the Gospel, There should be one Archbishop over the whole Kingdome; One Bishop over many hundred Pastors, in a Kingdome, and all they invested with that authority and Jurisdiction Apostolicall which they claim *jure Divino*, to be due unto them, and to reside in them, by the Ordinance of Christ; Certainly that Church that should renounce and disclaim such an Authority, ordained in the Church, cannot be a true Church, but a Synagogue of Sathan. For they that should renounce and deny such, must needs therein renounce and deny Christ himself. Thus the Assumption is cleared.

The eleventh Argument.

All Humane Traditions and Rites enjoyned to be performed in Gods worship as necessary to Salvation, are unlawfull.
These Ceremonies in controversie, being but Humane Traditions, are enjoyned to be performed in Gods worship, as necessary to Salvation: Ergo,
These Ceremonies are unlawfull.

THe Proposition is freely granted of all our Adversaries hitherto. If any hereafter, by reason of some difficulties, the cause may be thrust into by granting the same, shall be so desperate as to deny the same; we shall be ready to make it good, at any time.

The assumption is thus proved.

Whatsoever Humane Tradition, Ceremony, or Action, that may without sin, or inconvenience to any part of the Worship of God be omitted

in

in the same, and yet notwithstanding are injoyned and urged as more necessary than those Actions that are by the Word of God necessary to Salvation: I say, such humane Ceremonies and Traditions are injoined as necessary to Salvation.

But these Ceremonies are such, as may without any sin, or any inconvenience to any part of the Worship of God, be omitted in the same, and yet notwithstanding are enjoyned as more necessary for Christians to do, than those Actions that are necessary to Salvation by the Word of God: Ergo,

These Ceremonies in controversie are injoyned, &c. as necessary to Salvation.

He hath no blood of shame running in his veins, that will deny the Proposition.

The Assumption hath two parts:

The first is this,

That these Ceremonies are such as may, without sin, or any inconvenience to any part of the worship of God, be omitted.

This is evident: For 1. if they could not be omitted without sin in Divine Worship, they were Divine and not Humane Ordinances. For example, Though to go clothed to the Congregation be a Civil action, yet, because it is a sin, for any to go naked to the Congregation, It is a Divine Ordinance, That men should go clothed thither. And in this case (as in any other case of sin) a man ought rather never Worship God publickly, than to go naked to the Congregation. For the omission of a Good Action is no sin, when it cannot be done, but by committing of a sin? 2. Divine Worship consisting in Prayer, the Sacraments, and the Word, no wit of man can shew wherein the bare omission of any one of these Ceremonies is inconvenient to any one of these parts: for what inconvenience can a man (that is not drunk with the dreggs and lees of Popish Superstition) finde it to publick Prayer, to be said in the Congregation without a Priests Surplice? The omission of ordinary pawses and Accents, points and stopps, the suppressing of the voice, or a loud hooping and hallowing out of the words, or an undistinct sounding of them, were such actions as common reason will teach are inconvenient for Prayer, and so inconvenient, that a man ought never to pray publickly in the Congregation, as the voyce thereof, that should by Canon be tied thereto: And the Magistrate (though there were no Canon to the contrary) ought to

turn

turn such out of the Ministry that should omit such matters in prayer. But for a Minister to pray without a Surplice, can be in reason no more inconvenient, than for him to pray without Book, without a pair of spectacles upon his nose. And there may be as good reason given to prove it convenient for a man that saith a thing without Book, to put on a pair of Spectacles, as there can be to prove it convenient for him that is to pray in the Church, to put upon himself a white linen Garment.

The second part of the Assumption is this;

That they are injoined as more necessary for Christians to do, than those Actions that by the Word of God are necessary to Salvation.

Which I prove by this collection of Reasons;

1. *If the whole Solemn Worship and Mystery of Jesus must stoop and yield to these; And these must not stoop or yield to them.*

2. *If those that will yield to these are dispensed with, for omission of some duties that God requires of the Minister to be performed as necessary to Salvation, and those that are willing to do all necessary Services tending to the Salvation of Men, cannot be dispensed with for the omission of these, but must be turned out of Christs Service.*

3. *If those that refuse only conformity to these are worse than Idolatrous Papists.*

4. *If the bare omission of these, though upon tenderness of conscience, be Sedition, Schisme, Disloyalty, Rebellion, a denial of the Kings Supremacy, Anabaptistry, Frenzy, worthy imprisonment, Banishment, losse of Goods and Living.*

5. *If all that professe these to be unlawfull, are to be delivered up to Satan, and anathematized as men holding wicked and damnable Errours.*

6. *If a man being in that Church, ought not to be of it where these Ceremonies are omitted.*

7. *If the bare omission of these, make a Minister by our Law more subject to deprivation and suspension, than the commission of the foulest Crimes, even Drunkenness, Blasphemy, grosse Ignorance, uncleanness.*

8. *If her late Excellent Mr. Religion consisted in these. I say, If all these Assertions be true, then are they enjoined as more necessary to be done, then those Actions that by the Word of God are necessary to Salvation.*

But all these Eight points are to be justified; Ergo,

These Ceremonies are enjoyned as more necessary to be done, than some Actions that are necessary to Salvation.

The

1. The Proposition cannot be gainsayed. It being a Topick Axiom. *Cujus privatio est deterior, illud ipsum est melius*: to wit, The worse the Privation of a thing is, the better the thing is. For Example, If blindnesse be worse than deafnesse; Then is the positive habit of seeing better than that of hearing. So, if Non-conformity be worse than Drunkennesse, Blasphemy, Idolatry, Filthinesse of Body, &c. It must needs follow, that Conformity is a more excellent thing in it self than Sobriety; the true Worship of God, the glorifying of the name of God, than a chaste and honest life: But all these are urged by the Word of God, as necessary means to Salvation: For the Holy Ghost saith, *No Murderer, Adulterer, Unclean person, Idolater, &c. shall enter into the Kingdome of heaven.* If therefore Conformity be more urged by our Lawes than these, and the Privation more punished: If this be more strictly required of Christians, yea, of principal Christians, even the Ministers of the Word, than the other, they must needs be urged more necessary to Salvation than the other. For, of the more excellency a Christian vertue is, the more necessary to Salvation it is.

2. The Assumption in every part and parcel thereof may be justified by the practice and Assertions of our Adversaries, not only privately, but in publick: For the 1. God must not by Canon be Worshipped solemnly in *England*, except these be mingled with it, though without them he might be never so well worshipped. For the 2. Those that yield to these, need not preach at all in our Church except they will; No, nor to do any other part of Divine Service in their own person, if they will maintain a Curate, that will keep the Ceremonial Law, and fairly read or sing the Kings Service, as they call it: And yet if Preaching were not necessary to Salvation; *Paul*, that was above an Archbishop, should not have been under a woe, if he had not done it: For no Minister of the Gospel is under a woe, that performeth all services to the Churches of God that are necessary to Salvation. Neither was *Pauls* Preaching a Reading of *Homilies*, or of a Service Book. For the 3. Nothing is more notorious then for us that make scruple of these things to be reputed worse than Papists: One that is a great Judge in these causes Ecclesiastical, affirmed it unto my self. Another, of only at *Pauls* Crosse, in mine own hearing, made no doubt but the Papists were in the Church, but he made great doubt whether the Puritanes were. And yet we are Puritanes for nothing else, but for refusing Conformity.

to their Ceremonies: For, howsoever they slander us with many other gross imputations, yet they cannot lay any thing to our charge but our conscience in this. For all other matters concerning their own Estates and Dignities, considering how desperate they are, and unreformable, we can be content to leave them to the Judgment of God, who (as it seems) intendeth to glorifie himself by some other means, than by their Conversion. For the 4. Read *Scottish*, *Gourvet*, *The Survey*, *Remonstrance*, &c. And ye shall finde all this laid to their Charge. Also their practice sufficiently proveth it; for the Ministers that are of late suspended and deprived, only refusing to use these Ceremonies, bear their condemnation under these Names and Titles.

The 5. and 6. is proved by their own late Canons; For, if they be to be excommunicated *ipso facto*, as holding damnable and wicked Errours, that shall Profess any of these Ceremonies to be unlawfull, a man ought not to acknowledge himself a member of any such Church, as doth affectedly cast them out of Gods worship: For, for what Error a particular person is not to be reputed as a member of the Church, but as a Heathen and Publican; for the same a whole Church is not to be reputed a Church, but a *Synagogue of Satan*.

The 7. may be justified by many Instances of many vile and impious persons of those kindes tolerated in the Ministry.

The 8. is proved by him that answers the *Plea of the Innocent*, who saith, That they that call in question the lawfulness of these Ceremonies, call in question her late Majesties Religion; which they could not do, except (at the least) part of her Religion consisted in them.

Further, If this doth not sufficiently prove the main Assumption, let these Reasons following be wayed.

1. If the Church be necessary to Salvation, and if the Pillars of the Church be necessary to the Church, and if the Lord Bishops be the Pillars of the Church, and these or such like Cermonies be the main Supporters of Lord Bishops: then are these Ceremonies in the judgment of the Prelates necessary to Salvation. For no Church, no Salvation; no Pillar of the Church, no Church: No L. Bishop, no Pillar of the Church: No Ceremony, no Lord Bishop. *Ergo*, *No* Ceremony of this kinde, no Salvation.

2. All

2. All Divine Constitutions binding conscience are necessary to Salvation: But by the late Doctrine of the Prelates and others, these Ceremonies (being not unlawfull) when they are commanded by the Church, are said not to be humane but Divine Constitutions, binding conscience; therefore they (as they are urged) are necessary to Salvation. For all divine Constitutions binding conscience, are necessary to Salvation; or else, nothing on our part can be said in any sence to be necessary thereunto.

3. It is necessary to Salvation, that men should not only worship God, but worship him in a comely, decent, and orderly manner, it being a matter of damnation to worship God in a confused, unseemly, and disordered manner, but by the Doctrine of our Prelates, comelinesse, decency, and order, consists in the use of these Ceremonies; *Ergo*, in their Judgement they are necessary to Salvation.

Objection: The Church doth not intend to urge these things, as necessary to Salvation. *Ergo*, They are not urged as necessary to Salvation.

Answer 1. The Church urgeth not these things at all, but only three or four Bishops in the Church, which (if their own Doctrine be true) are usurpers over our Churches, and not so much as any true members of a Church.

What if the Synod should Decree that the King should hold the Arch-Bishops stirrop, and the Prince and Nobles kiss his toe, once or twice a year; and withall they should protest, that they do not require this as a worship, or homage to the Archbishop, but only for comelinesse, Order, and Edification, were not this a shamefull shift, as bad as the thing it self.

The twelfth Argument.

under a greater penalty than bodily death; for his Sword can cut no deeper, and then in the case of Scandal a Christian Subject ought rather to suffer the Magistrate to take away his life, than to do that which shall procure the Damnation of his Brothers Soul. And in this doing, he is no contemner of the Magistrates Law, but a fulfiller of the Law of Charity, in not destroying his brothers Soul upon the meer pleasure of a mortal man.

Object. *But the commandment of the Magistrate takes away the scandal, when the thing is done in Obedience to him.*

Answ. This is another desperate shift. As though the conscience of the weak brother that judgeth a thing indifferent to be a Sin, will be ever the more satisfied and relieved in the matter by the authority of the Magistrate, nothing but the authority of God rather can or ought to satisfie a doubting conscience. And as for them that put superstition in things indifferent, and are this way scandalized, the authority of the Magistrate or Church commanding them, their scandal is encreased, and not removed by the same.

Object. *But we must more respect Obedience to the Magistrate, than the scandal of inferiour persons, the thing commanded being indifferent and not evil.*

Answ. 1. The thing commanded is not indifferent, then when it is a scandal and stumbling block to our brother. 2. We must obey the Magistrate only in the Lord, but this is not to obey him in the Lord, only upon his pleasure to destroy a soul for whom Christ died. 3. An obedience to the Magistrate, so far as to the condemnation of our brothers soul, must be a special obedience, in some special good and just commandment, which cannot be verified of a commandment that requireth only a thing indifferent, much less such an indifferent, as is a scandal, and means of destruction to mens souls.

4. Such a forbearing of obedience only in love to the salvation of our brothers soul, being without apparent contempt of the Magistrate, and having adjoyned with it a meek submission to the mercy of the Magistrate, cannot be called a disobedience, but is indeed a better obedience than theirs, that do contrary, who in their obedience bring the blood of the souls they destroy, both upon their own heads, and the Magistrate, which is a sin in the eyes of God worse than rebellion.

Object.

Object. But by obedience to these Ceremonies many souls by means of preaching are saved, which shall want the means in the refusal.

Answ. 1. We must not destroy the souls of some, that we may save the souls of other, we must do that which is just, though the World go to wrack for it.

2. The greatest good that a man can do, cannot countervail the least evil, much less so great an evil as to be a witting instrument of the damnation of a brothers soul.

3. He that preacheth cannot assure himself of the salvation of one soul by the same, for that is wrought by the work of the Spirit of God. And he hath little cause to hope for a blessing upon that preaching which he purchaseth with the price of blood, yea, of the blood of souls.

Object. *But the King, the Magistrate and State are scandalized also at the omission of them, and their scandal is more to be respected than the scandal of inferiour persons, for the using of them.*

Answ. 1. For his Majesty, we doubt not but (if the Prelates would) he would easily yield to the removal of them, and therefore he cannot be scandalized at the refusal, when it is of meer conscience, though of conscience deceived. 2. The States and Inferiour Magistrates of the Kingdom have in all Parliaments shewed themselves willing, and ready to see their hands in the removal of them. 3. If the King and State will be scandalized, because upon their meer will and pleasure, I will not do that which I am perswaded will be a means of the destruction of their souls for whom Christ died: They will be much more scandalized at me if I do it; For such an obedience as this, must needs be a means of begetting or confirming strange sins in their souls: for as it is a kind of deifying of themselves, To require (even in the case of scandal) a thing indifferent to be done; so they that shall in such a case obey, cannot but nourish exceedingly that corruption from which such a commandment shall proceed. 4. The soul of the meanest and poorest in a Kingdom cost as great a price, and is as dear to Christ, as the soul of the Noblest, and in the matter of scandal, as great heed is to be taken to them, as to any other: And it shews of what spirit these men are of, that think they may betray the souls of Christs little ones, rather than displease a mortal man.

Object,

Object. *What, Must the Magistrates Laws be changed for every humour that will pretend scandal?*

Answ. Yes, such Laws as command only *things indifferent*, in cases of general scandal, are to be changed; or pretended scandal, are (at the least) to be dispensed with: For if Laws that command things necessary, are sometimes to be dispenced with, and if of them it is said, *Summum jus summa injuria*. Much more then such Laws as require only such things as are indifferent. 1. Such things that (but for the Commanders pleasure) makes no matter whether they be done or no. Which are indeed unworthy to be commanded of Worthies. 2. A pretended scandal in humour is easily discerned by those that are wise and not malicious, for they that are ready to performe all obedience to the Magistrate in all other heavier and greater things, are ready in his Service to spend their goods and lives, that think nothing too dear for the redeeming of his safety, that are in all other things as obedient, and more obedient than any other of his subjects: It is not to be supposed of any, (that are not possest with the malicious spirit of Antichrist) that such should refuse to obey the Kings pleasure in a toye, and a trifle, (such as are all things indifferent) except that in obeying him they were perswaded that they should sin against their own conscience, which, next unto God, they have cause to please, far above all the Kings of the earth, for it hath greater power to torment them than they have.

But I prove the Assumption.

All apparent means of confirming men in Schism, Superstition, and Idolatry, by reason whereof many have profanely lived and died therein without repentance, are apparent means of the damnation and destruction of many souls amongst us: But

These Ceremonies are such. Ergo,

The Proposition cannot be denied, for what action of man can be said to be a means of the damnation and destruction of anothers soul, if these actions be not, that confirm men in such foul sins? So that either a man can do nothing that shall destroy his brothers soul (which is directly against the expres words of S. *Paul*) Or else such a conformity, in such actions as confirm men in such damnable sins, doth destroy his soul.

The

The Assumptions are evident as any such matter can be. For

1. The Papists, not only amongst us, (which are innumerable) but others also do profess, that by our use of these Ceremonies (which are consecrated mysteries of their own Religion) they are confirmed in the truth of their Religion, and the falshood of ours. And good reason they have so to judge: For if the broth be good that the Devil is sod in, sure the Devil himself must needs be good also. 2. Those Christians of the Seperation, that are called *Brownists*, being many hundreds, professing the same faith that we do, are by the retaining of Reliques, confirmed in their Schism, and Seperation from us; And live and die in this opinion: *That our Churches are no true Churches, and that a man cannot, without sin, communicate with them.* And the main ground of this is, for that we mingle with Divine worship these base and vile inventions of men, Yea, of the accursed Antichrist. What? Is a linnen rag, and a Christs Cross, &c. to be reputed of so great value and price, that the fellowship and spiritual communion of so many Christians, (as sound in religion as any Prelate in the Realm) should be contemned and rejected for them?

3. Common experience teacheth us, that there are infinite numbers in this Realm ignorant and superstitious folk, that place as much, or more holiness in these things, than in the holy Ordinances of God; And how can it be otherwise, when they shall see the Rulers of the Church, mingle Heaven, Earth, and Hell together in this manner about them. Cursing, and anathematizing all that shall not embrace them. How can they but imagine, that the sight of a Surplice upon a Priests back shall bring them to heaven, when they shall see those that keep Heaven Keys, send a man, for want of such a wedding garment, *ipso facto*, to hell?

4. If it be but considered, that all other Protestant Churches have rejected them as menstruous cloaths, that more than the greatest number of Pastors in our own Land, that desires the name of faithful and painful Teachers, either count them impious, or at least the burdens or reproaches of our Churches: that the first appointers of them, (after our seperation from *Rome*) intended only a toleration of them, that the most scandalous and loud persons in our Congregations, are the hottest for them, that every Parliament since her Majesties raign

hath

hath been forward in the removing of them, than the defence of them hath driven men to run into the broching of many grosse and Popish errours. And that so many Ministers, (a catalogue of whose names and states, I could wish were published to all posterity,) that it may see the wonderfull milde and moderate government of Prelates, have endured and expected daily to endure the greatest extremities for the same: I say, if these things be duly considered, a man shall easily see, that these ceremonies are stumbling blocks, layd by the Devill and his Agents in the wayes of all the people of this Realm, to hinder the progresse of the Gospel, and to make all men stumble in the wayes of salvation.

AN ADDITION.

NOt onely our Conformers unto *Rome*, but they also that abhor the same, can hardly endure to bear, *that these Ceremonies are parts of divine worship*, for whose further satisfaction I add this one Argument.

Whatsoever being used in divine worship, is directly contrary to the 2d. Commandement, is a part of divine worship.

These Ceremonies are used in divine worship, and are directly contrary to the 2d. commandement. Ergo

The Proposition is evident, for all outward Idolatry is Divine worship, and nothing but outward Idolatry is *directly* forbidden in the 2d. Commandement.

The second part of the Assumption is thus proved,

All inventions and devices of man, grounded onely upon the will of man, and not upon any necessity of nature, or civility, set a-part to Gods outward worship, are contrary to the second Commandement.

These Ceremonies are such, Ergo.

The proposition we prove thus.

*Either all such devices and inventions are contrary unto the 2d. commandement, or else there is no * Synecdoche therein.*

But there is a Synecdoche in the 2d. Commandement.

The Assumption or latter part of this Syllogisme cannot be denyed of any, but such as shall desperately set themselves, against the truth of God. For if there were no figure or Trope in the commandement, then to bow down unto, and so worship the Sun, Moon and Starrs, or any other of Gods creatures, yea, or

* A trope or figure of speech, wherein under one kind of Idolatry all sorts are forbidden.

or any image made by any other, should be no breach of this commandement, much leſs to offer Jewiſh Sacrifices of ſheep and Oxen, to circumciſe, to go a pilgrimage to Saints, to kiſſe the Paxe, to ſprinkle with holy water, to baptize Bells, or to uſe any other Popiſh rites; in which if a man ſin not againſt the ſecond commandement, he ſinneth not againſt any.

Again, It would be demanded, againſt what commandement, *Nadab* and *Abihu* ſinned, when they offered ſtrange fire. The Iſraelites, when they ſhaked *Gideons* Ephod, *Judg.* 8. 27. The Corinthians in eating meat offered to Idols, in the Idols Temples, 1 Cor. 9. Either they ſinned not againſt this commandement, and by conſequent againſt none, or elſe there muſt needs be a wonderfull large Trope in the ſame; which I think never any Divine, Jew or Chriſtian, Proteſtant or Papiſt ever denyed before now.

The propoſition is as evident if it be conſidered, that in the 2.d commandement, literally and in propriety of ſpeech, nothing is forbidden, but the making of Images for worſhip, and the bowing down unto them & worſhiping of them: Now if there be a Synecdoche in the commandement, there muſt of neceſſity be not onely other kinds of falſe outward worſhip of Idolatry, different in form from making and bowing down unto Images and Idols, but there muſt be alſo ſome common cauſe or ground, upon which making and bowing unto Images is forbidden, which muſt be the third Argument, and reaſon by which all other kinds of falſe outward worſhip are brought under bowing unto Images, & condemne in that, elſe it were fenſeleſs to make any thing that is not a bowing down unto Images to be condemned under that name and title. For when one thing is condemned under another, it is becauſe that thing doth communicate with it in the ſame cauſe for which it is condemned. For example; if under, bowing down unto Images, Jewiſh Circumciſion, Sacrifices, *&c.* are forbidden, foraſmuch as theſe cannot in any ſenſe be called *Bowing down to Images*, there muſt be ſome cauſe why bowing down unto Images is forbidden, which muſt ſtretch it ſelfe unto them, and bring them under it, which muſt be as it were a common *genus* unto it and them.

Now let all the wits in the world lay their heads together, and they ſhall never be able to deviſe any ſuch common *genus*, that ſhall be the common cauſe why not onely *bowing down to Images*:

gen : but why, under it all other kind of Idolatry and false worship is condemned, but this, for that they were *humane devices, & inventions*, and therefore under the most usual and generall received invention of man, God condemneth all other *Inventions* used to the same end. If this be not the reason then there are and may be infinite, outward Idolatries and Superstitions that cannot with any reason be referred to this commandement. Therefore it must needs follow that either there is no trope in the commandement, or that all such inventions of man are forbidden in the same.

An Advertisement.

I had thought (good Reader) to have fortified some other poynts in the Arguments, which to them that do not consider may seem weak, but I forbear for some speciall reasons, I am onely to admonish thee of one defect amongst others, that hath passed me, *viz.* The mistaking of the Archbishops Argument, though I made it better then it was. For thus it is, and hath been I know not how oft (as unanswerable) been propounded.

Those Ceremonies whose doctrine is sound and good, are lawfull and good ceremonies. The doctrine of these ceremonies is sound and good. Ergo,

Which is subject to the very same absurdities that the other, and more also. For 1. the Doctrine of them is unsound & false, for the doctrine of them is this, that they are matters indifferent, of order, decency, and edification, no parts of Divine worship, that they are Schismaticks that will not conform unto them, enemies to the Supremacy and State, that it is a wicked errour to hold them unlawfull and superstitious, that they are to be excommunicated that affirm them to be so, *&c.* All which is unsound doctrine concerning them.

2. Grant the Doctrine sound, yet it followeth not that the Ceremonies are good; for the thing may be wicked, any yet the doctrine of it sound. For, There is a sound doctrine of all vices.

3. In what respect doth he affirme the doctrine to be sound and good? Is it not from the use and end that is assigned unto them by himself? Because they are appointed for such and such ends? Hence will follow the very same absurdities, that I have observed in the former. For then any ridiculous or base Ceremony, may be instituted, so it be under pretence of a good end.

A PROTESTATION OF THE Kings Supremacy,

Made in the name of the afflicted MINISTERS, and opposed to the shamefull Calumniations of the PRELATES.

PSAL. 7. 3. 5.

O Lord my God, if I have done this thing, if there be any wickedness in my hands; Then let the Enemy persecute my soule, and take it, let him tread my life down upon the earth, and lay mine honour in the Dust. Selah.

JOHN 18. 23.

If I have spoken evill, beare witnesse of the evill: But if I have spoken well, why smitest thou me.

Printed in the year, 1660.

To the civil States of this Kingdome.

[redacted]

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

A PROTESTATION of the Kings Supremacy.

WE hold and maintain, the same Authority and Supremacy in all causes and over all persons Civil and Ecclesiastical, granted by Statute to Queen *Elizabeth*, and expressed and declared in the book of Advertisements and Injunctions, and in Mr. *Bilson* against the Jesuites, so he doe in full and ample manner (without any limitation or qualification) to the King and his Heirs and Successours for ever. Neither is there (to our knowledge) any one of us, but is and ever hath been most willing to *subscribe* and *swear* unto the same, according to form of Statute, And we desire that those that shall refuse the same may bear their own iniquity.

2. We are so far from judging the said Supremacy to be unlawful, that we are perswaded that the King should sin highly against God, if he should not assume the same unto himself, and that the Churches within his Dominions should sin damnably, if they should deny to yield the same unto him, yea though the Statutes of the Kingdom should deny it unto him.

3. We hold it plain Antichristianism for any Church, or Church Officers whatsoever, either to arrogate or assume unto themselves any part or parcel thereof, & utterly unlawful for the King to give away or alienate the same from his own Crown and dignity to any spiritual potentates or rulers whatsoever within or without his dominions.

3. We hold that though the Kings of this Realm were no Members of the Church but very Infidels, yea & persecutors of the truth that yet those Churches that shall be gathered together within these Dominions ought to acknowledge and yeild the said supremacy unto them. And that the same is not tyed to their faith and Christianity but to their very Crown from which no subject or subjects have power to separate or disjoyne it.

5. We hold that neither King nor civil estate are bound in matter of Religion to be subject and obedient to any Ecclesiastical person or persons whatsoever, no further then they shall be able to convince their consciences of the truth thereof out of the

Word

Word of God. Yea we think they should sin against God, if they should ground their Religion, or any part or parcel thereof upon the bare Testimony or Judgement of any man, or of all the men in the world.

6. We hold that no Churches or Church-Officers have power for any crime whatsoever to deprive the King of the least of his Royal Prerogatives whatsoever, much less to deprive him of his Supremacy wherein the Height of his Royal Dignity consists.

7. We hold that in all things concerning this life whatsoever, the Civil Jurisdiction of Kings and Civil States excelleth and ought to have preeminence over the Ecclesiasticall, and that the Ecclesiasticall neither hath, nor ought to have any power in the least degree over the bodies, lives, goods, or liberty of any person whatsoever, much lesse of the Kings and Rulers of the Earth.

8. We hold that Kings by vertue of their supremacy have power; yea also that they stand bound by the Law of God to make Laws Ecclesiastical such as shall tend to the good ordering of the Churches in their Dominions; And that the Churches ought not to be disobedient to any of their Lawes, so far as in obedience unto them, they do not that which is contrary to the Word of God.

9. We hold that though the King shall command any thing contrary to the Word into the Churches, that yet they ought not to resist him therein, but onely peaceably to forbear Obedience, and sue unto him for grace and mercy; and where that cannot be obtained, meekely to submit themselves to the punishment.

10. We hold that the King hath power by vertue of his supremacy, to remove out of the Churches, whatsoever he shall discern to be practised therein not agreeable to the Word of God. And if he shall see any defect either in the Worship of God, or in the Ecclesiastical Discipline, he ought by his royal Authority and power to procure and force the redress thereof, yea, though it be without the consent and against the will of the Ecclesiastical Governors themselves.

11. We hold that the King hath as much Authority over the Body, Goods, and Affaires, of Ecclesiastical persons, as of any other of his Subjects whatsoever. And that by his Authority, he may force them not onely to all civil duties belonging unto them,

but

but also unto Ecclesiastical: afflicting as great punishment upon them for the neglect thereof, as upon any other of his Subjects.

12. We *hold* that he hath power, to remove out of the Churches, all Scandalous Schismatical and Heretical Teachers, and by all due severity of Lawes to repress them.

13. We hold that all Ecclesiastical Lawes made by the King (not repugnant to the Word of God) do in some sort bind the consciences of his Subjects: and that no subject ought to refuse obedience to any such Law.

14. We hold that the King onely hath power within his Dominions, to convene Synods or general Assemblies of Ministers, and by his Authority Royal, to ratifie and give life and strength, to their Canons and Constitutions, without whose ratification, no man can force any subject to yeild any Obedience unto the same.

15. We hold that though the King may force the Churches to be subject and obedient unto him: and to be Members of the Common-wealth; yet that the Churches severally or joyntly, have no power to force him: or any Subject, against their will to any service unto them, or to any religions duty whatsoever. No, nor to be so much as a Member of any Church.

16. We hold that the King ought not to be subject to the Ecclesiastical Censures of any Churches, Church Officers or Synods whatsoever, but onely to that Church and those Officers of his own Court and Household, unto whom (in reverence of their Religion and of the spiritual Graces of God he sees shining in them) he shall of his own free will, subject and commit the Regiment of his Soul, in whom there can be no suspition nor fear of any partiality, or unjust or rigorous dealing against him.

17. We hold that if any Ecclesiastical Governours (call them by what name you will) shall abuse their Ecclesiastical Authority in the execution of their censures, upon any man whosoever; That the King and Civil States under him, have power to punish them severely for it, much more if they shall abuse it upon the Supream Majesty himself.

18. If the King subjecting himself to spiritual Guides and Governours, shall afterwards refuse to be guided and governed by them according to the Word of God, and living in notorious sin without Repentance shall wilfully contemn and despise all their holy

holy and religious Censures, that then these Governours are to refuse to administer the *holy things* of God unto him, and to leave him to himself and to the secret Judgement of God, & wholly to resign and give over that spiritual charge and tuition over him, which by calling from God and the King they did undertake. And more then this they may not do. And after all this, We hold that he yet still retaineth, and ought to retain, intirely and solidly, all that aforesaid supream power and Authority over the Churches of this Dominion, in as ample a manner, as if he were the most Christian Prince in the World.

19. *We* acknowledge King *JAMES* to be our onely lawful Sovereign, and unto him to be due all the aforesaid *Supremacy*, and we renounce and abjure all Opinions, Doctrines, Practises, whatsoever repugnant or contrary to the same, as Anabaptistical and Antichristian, and wish they may be severely punished.

20. We never refused Obedience to any Lawes or Commandements of the King, or State whatsoever, but onely to such as we have proved or are ready to prove, (if we might be heard with indifferency) to be contrary to the Word of God. And we are ready to take our Solemn Oathes, before the Throne of Justice, that the onely cause of our refusal of Obedience to those Canons of the Prelates for which we are at present so extreamly afflicted, is meere Conscience, and a fear to sin against God. And that if by due form of reasoning we may be convinced in our Consciences of the contrary, we are as willing as any Subjects in the Realm to Obey and Conform.

21. We refuse Obedience onely to such Canons as require the performance of such Acts, and Rites of Religion, as are rejected and abandoned of all other Reformed Churches, as Superstitious Disorders, Such, as are special Mysteries of the Romish Antichristian Idolatry, Such as have been controverted in the Church ever since the last breaking forth of the Light of the Gospel out of the cloud of Popery in *Luthers* time. Such as all Protestant Writers and Defenders of our Faith beyond the Seas, and most of our own Country men have either in general or particular condemned as vain, idle, and unprofitable, Such as all the Faithful, and Painful Pastors of this Realm, and in a manner all States and degrees of the same, would be content were removed, and swept out of the Church, and for which few or none are zealous but the Prelates, and their Adherents.

22. We

22. We deny no Authority to the King, in matters Ecclesiastical, but onely that which Christ Jesus the onely Head of the Church hath directly, and precisely appropriated unto himself, and hath denyed to communicate to any other creature or creatures in the World. For we hold, That Christ alone is the Doctor of the Church in matters of Religon, and that the Word of Christ which he hath given unto his Church, is of absolute perfection, containing in it all parts of the true Religion, both for Substance and Ceremony, and a perfect direction in all Ecclesiastical matters whatsoever. Unto and from which it is not lawful for any Man or Angel, to add or detract.

23. We are so far from making claim of any supremacy unto our selves (and those Ecclesiastical Officers which we desire) that we exclude from our selves and them (as that of which we are utterly uncapable) all Princely and Lordly state, pompe and power whatsoever, holding it a sin for any whosoever to exercise (no not by commission from the Magistrate) any Authority over the Body, Goods, Lives, Liberty of any Man whosoever for any crime or offence whatsoever. So that any one of the baseſt and most inferiour civil officers in a Kingdom hath and ought to have (in our Judgement) more Authority and Power over men then any or all the Ecclesiastical Officers in the same Kingdom or in the whole World. Yea we hold that the highest Ecclesiastical Officer in the Church ought to be as subject unto the baseſt civil officers in the Kingdom, as the meanest Subject in the Kingdom; And that they ought not by virtue of their office, to challenge any freedom or immunity at all from any Civil Subjection whatsoever, belonging to any common Subject.

24. *We* confine and bound all Ecclesiastical power within the limits onely of one particular Congregation, holding that the greatest Ecclesiastical power ought not to stretch beyond the same; And that it is an arrogating of Princely Supremacy, for any Ecclesiastical person, or Persons whosoever, to take upon themselves Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction over many Churches, much more over whole Kingdomes and Provinces of Christians.

25. We *hold* it utterly unlawful for any one Minister to take upon himself, or accept of a sole Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction over so much as one Congregation. And therefore we hold that some of the sufficienteſt and most honeſt and godly men in the Congregation, ought to be chosen by the Heads of Families, to be adjoyn-

ed in Commission as assistants to the Minister, in the spiritual Regiment of the souls of that Congregation, of which he is the pastor.

26. We *hold* that these Ecclesiastical Officers being so chosen by the Church or Congregation are to exercise over the said Congregation only a Spiritual Iurisdiction and power, consisting in a carefull oversight of the outward behaviour of the Members of their Church, That it be not scandalous, offensive, and unbeseeming Christians. And if any Member shall be delinquent they are brotherly to admonish him, shewing him the nature of his crime by the word of God. And if after two or three admonitions, he shew no tokens of sorrow and penitencie, then are they to deny unto him the pledges and seales of the Church, to wit the Sacraments. If this cannot humble him but that he continue obstinate in that sin, then they are by the mouth of the Minister in Congregation (the whole Church consenting freely thereto) denounce him to be no Member of the Kingdom of Heaven, and so forbear to have any further charge over him, untill God shall work the grace of Repentance in him; in this manner they are to proceed against all apparent and Evident crimes only, as Murder, Adultery, Theft, Blasphemie, Ribaldery, Lying, Slandering, Profanation of the Sabbothes, contempt of Divine Worship, Disobedience to the Civil Magistrate, &c. Neither ought the extreamest of the Ecclesiastical Censures any whit hinder the course of justice that the Civil Magistrate is to exercise against the same crimes; for if a Traytor himself should be penitent, the Church ought to forgive him and lovingly to imbrace him as a Son, but the Magistrate ought to execute him, if he should be obstinate in that crime. As the Magistrate ought to cut him off from the Civil Communion of men, so ought the Congregation (of which he is a Member) cut him off from all spiritual Communion with them. If any one of the Ecclesiastical Officers themselves shall sin, he is subject to the censures of the rest as any other member of the congregation. If they shall all sin scandalously either in the execution of their Office or in any other ordinarie manner: Then the Congregation that chose them freely, hath as free power to depose them, and to place others in their room. If the Congregation shall erre, either in choosing or deposing of her spiritual Officers, Then hath the Civil Magistrate alone power and authority to punish

them for their fault, to compel them to make better choiſe, or to defend againſt them thoſe Officers that without juſt cauſes they ſhall depoſe or deprive.

27. We hold that thoſe Eccleſiaſtical Perſons that make claim to greater power and authority then this, Eſpecially they that make claim *Iure Divino* of power and Iuriſdiction to meddle with other Churches then that one Congregation of which they are or ought to be members, Do uſurp upon the Supremacy of the Civil Magiſtrate, who alone hath and ought to have (as we hold and maintain) a power over the ſeveral Congregations in his Dominions, and who alone ought by his authority not only to preſcribe common Laws and Canons of uniformity and conſent, in Religion and worſhip of God unto them all; But alſo to puniſh the offences of the ſeveral Congregations, that they ſhall commit againſt the laws of God, the policy of the Realm, and the Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions enacted by his authority.

28. We hold that the King ought not to give this authority away or to commit it to any Eccleſiaſtical Perſon or Perſons whatſoever, But ought himſelf to be as it were, Archbiſhop and general overſeer of all the Churches within his Dominions, and ought to imploy under him, his honourable Counſel, his Iudges, Leiftenants, Iuſtices, Conſtables and ſuch like to overſee the Churches, in the ſeveral diviſions of their civil Regiments, viſiting them and puniſhing by their civil power whatſoever they ſhall ſee amiſs in any of them: Eſpecially in the Rulers and Governers.

29. For as much as no people are more hated, perſecuted and wronged of the wicked world then the true Churches of Chriſt; We hold that no people in the Earth ſtand in more need of the civil Magiſtrate then they. And that it is the greateſt outward bleſſing they can injoy in this life, to live under the Protection of their Swords & Scepters, & the greateſt cauſe of mourning when the ſame ſhall be bent againſt them. And we hold thoſe Churches to be no true Churches of Jeſus Chriſt that living in any Country, ſhall refuſe ſubjection to the civil Regents and Governers of the ſame, be they (in reſpect of Religion) never ſuch Paganiſh Infidells.

30. We hold it utterly unlawfull, for any Chriſtian Churches whatſoever, by any armed force or power, againſt the will of the civil magiſtracy and State under which they live, To

erect

erect and set up in publique, the true worship and service of God or to beat down or suppress any superstition or Idolatry that shall be countenanced and maintained by the same. Only, Every man is to look to himself, that he communicate not with the evils of the times, induring what it shall please the State to inflict; and seeking by all honest and peaceable means all reformation of publick abuses, onely at the hands of civil publicke persons, and all practises contrarie to these, we condemn as seditious and sinfull.

31. All that we crave of his Majestie and the State, is, that by his and their permission and under their protection, and approbation, it may be lawfull for us, to serve and worship God in all things according to his revealed will, and the manner of all other reformed Protestant Churches, that have made separation from *Rome*, that we may not be forced against our consciences to stain and pollute the simple and syncere worship of God prescribed in his word, with any humane Traditions and Rites whatsoever, but that in Divine worship we may be actors only of those things that may for matter or manner either ingeneral or special be concluded out of the word of God. Also to this end that it may be lawfull for us to exhibite unto them and unto their Censure a true and syncere Confession of our faith, containing the main Grounds of our Religion, unto which all other doctrines are to be consonant: as also a Form of Divine worship and Ecclesiastical Government, in like manner warranted by the word, and to be observed of us all under any civil punishment that it shall please the said Majestie, and State to inflict, under whose authority alone, we desire to exercise the same: and unto whose punishment alone we desire to be subject if we shall offend against any of those Lawes and Canons that themselves shall approve in manner aforesaid: and our desire is, Not to worship God in dark corners, but in such publick places and at such convenient times as it shall please them to assigne, to the intent, that they and their officers may the better take notice of our offences (if any such shall be committed in our Congregations, and assemblies) that they may punish the same accordingly. And we desire we may be subject to no other Spirituall Lords but unto Christ, nor unto any other Temporal Lords but unto themselves, whom alone in this Earth we desire to make our Judges and Supreame Governers and Overseers in all

causes

causes *Ecclesiastical* whatsoever, renouncing as Antichristian, all such *Ecclesiastical* powers as arrogate and assume unto themselves under any pretence of the Law of God or man, the said power which we acknowledge to be due only to the Civil Magistrate.

32. So long as it shall please the King and civil *State* (though to the great derogation of their own authority as we may have occasion hereafter to prove) to maintain in this Kingdome, the *State* of the Hierarchy or Prelacie: We can (in Honour to his Majestie and the *State*, and in desire of peace) be content without envy to suffer them to injoy their state and dignity, and to live as brethren, amongst those ministers that shall acknowlege spiritual homage unto their spiritual Lordships, paying unto them all temporal duties, of tenths and such like: yea and joyning with them in the service and worship of God so far as we may do it without our own particular communicating with them in those humane Traditions and rites, that in our consciences we judge to be unlawfull. Only we crave in all dutifull manner that which the very Law of Nature yeeldeth unto us, that for as much as they are most malicious enemies unto us and do apparently thirst either after our blood, or shipwrack of our faith and consciences, that they may not hence forth be our judges in these causes, but that we may both of us stand as parties at the bar of the Civil Magistrate to be tried in those differences that are between us, and that when they shall publickly maligne or slander us or our cause, it may be lawfull for us in a dutifull, sober, peaceable and modest manner without personal reproach or disgrace, in as publick manner justifie our selves, and then insteed of that sillie mockservice to the King of wearing a linnen rag upon our backs or making a Christles Crosse upon a Babies face, we shall be ready to perform and yeeld triple homage, service, and tribute unto him, and shall think our lives and all that we have too vile to spend in the service of him and the civil state under him.

22. 9. 49

FINIS.

causes Ecclesiastical whatsoever, renouncing as Antichristian, all such Ecclesiastical powers as are quite and assume unto themselves under any pretence of the Law of God or man, the said power which we acknowledge to be due only to the Civil Magistrate.

22. So long as it shall please the King and civil State (though to the great derogation of their own authority as we may have occasion hereafter to prove) to maintain in this Kingdome, the State of the Hierarchy or Prelacie: We can (in Honour to his Majesty and the State, and in desire of peace) be content without [illegible] to suffer them to injoy their state and dignity, and to [illegible] brethren, amongst those ministers that shall acknowledge spiritual homage unto their spiritual Lordships, paying unto them all temporal duties of tenths and such like: yea and joyning with them in the service and worship of God so far as we may do it without our own particular communicating with them in those humane Traditions and rites, that in our conscience we judge to be unlawfull. Only we crave in all dutifull manner that which the very Law of Nature yeeldeth unto us, that for as much as they are most malicious enemies unto us and do apparently thirst either after our blood, or ship-wrack of our faith and conscience, that they may not hence forth be our judges in these causes, but that we may both of us stand as parties at the bar of the Civil Magistrate to be tried in those differences that are between us, and that when they shall publickly maligne or slander us or our cause, it may be lawfull for us in a dutifull, sober, peaceable and modest manner without personal reproach or disgrace, in as publick manner justifie our selves, and then instead of that fillie [illegible] service to the King of wearing a linnen rag upon our backs or making a Christian Crosse upon a Babies face, we shall be ready to perform and yeeld triple homage, service, and tribute unto him, and shall think our lives and all that we have too vile to spend in the service of him and the civil state under him.

FINIS.

A PROPOSITION CONCERNING KNEELING in the very Act of RECEIVING.

Howsoever,

Published to satisfie Professours,

yet humbly Submitted to the Judgement of PROPHETS.

ROM. 14. 10, 11, 12.

Why doest thou condemn thy Brother, For it is written, I live (saith the Lord) and every Knee shall bow unto me. So then, every one of us shall give accounts of himself unto God.

1 COR. 10, 14, 21.

Flee from Idolatry, Yee cannot be partakers of the Lords Table, and of the Table of Devils.

Printed in the year, 1660.

Tomy Christian Friend, N. Grace and Peace.

HOwsoever it grieveth me to hear of, much more to see the troubles wherewith Sathan (knowing his time to be short) doth trouble the Church of God in all places, about unprofitable and Popish Ceremonies, yet (to tell you the whole troth) my Grief is the lesse, when I consider that both they themselves, who be most troublesome, and do most urge those Reliques of *Rome*, be ambitious, or Dumb Doggs, or Non-Resident, serving their Bellies, and minding Earthly Things; even like their Predecessors, who urged the Ceremonies of *MOSES* in the Primitive Churches, and their proceedings, (like themselves) be so exorbitant that they cannot but prove odious to all men. What a matter is this, that after the Sacramental Bread is ministred, the Cup should be denyed because of not Kneeling? If any of these scrupulous Ministers had played such a part, though it were with one *openly known to live in sin, notorious without* [illegible], *whom by the 26. Canon no Minister shall in any wise admit to the Receiving of the Holy Communion*, how would that Precision be trounced. But in this Puritan Government of the Church there is no fault but *Non Conformity* to superstitious vanities; A Bird of their feather may Preach scores of Popish Doctrines, be scandalous in Life, and at his last cast at Dice when he hath lost all, say; *In the Spite of God let him do now what he can*, and yet hold his own well enough; An other Mans own and ill enough, I might well say if the Law might have due course: well, God amend all, and restrain the remnant of this Rage. In the mean while I rejoyce to hear that it is given to any of Gods people not onely to believe in Christ, but also to suffer for his sake, having the same fight which they see or hear to be in their Ministers, as it becometh the Gospel of Christ, the sincerity whereof belongeth as well to the people as to the Ministers of Christ. For howsoever all are not to wear the Whore of *Babylons* Smocks, yet all are to make [illegible] the Knee

Rom. 16. 17, 18. Phil. 3. 2, 19. Gal. 6. 12.

Phil. 1. 27.

Knee to *Baal*. To confirm your zeal against the superstition of KNEELING, I have long sought (being often sollicited to do by you) and at length found a short but (in my poor judgement at least to me) a sufficient discourse which I have printed, that I may comfort not onely you, but many others also who are in doubt, with that comfort wherewith I my self am comforted of God. I say comforted. For when the judgement is satisfied the heart is comforted; This onely I require of you that there be no inquiring after or guessing at the Author or Publisher. If that hurtful curiosity were mortified, learned men now fearing that humour would be bolder to write and publish their Godly Judgements, touching points in controversie; among other I hear of a more large and learned Treatise of this point, which no doubt the Author will publish in time, or other for him, if curious Heads, itching Ears, and wanton Tongues, do not hinder. In the mean while let us make as good use of this, as we can, And the Lord give us understanding in all things.

Farewell.

CHAP. II.

KNEELING in the very Act of Taking, Eating and Drinking the Sacramental Bread and Wine, in the holy Communion, cannot be without sin.

1. IT is to be understood, that, howsoever Kneeling may (in it self considered) be esteemed a natural gesture of the body, as *standing, sitting*, &c. yet in this case, it is by Institution of Man. For neither nature nor custom, doth teach us ordinarily to kneele when we eat and drink, neither doth the Word require *Kneeling* in this case.

2. If it be by institution, it must be either in respect of a more reverent receiving, or not. But if the most solemn sign of reverence (used in these parts of the World) be without all respect of reverence, and that by Institution of Authority, in so high a part of Gods Service, may not such Kneeling be judged, if not a gross mocking of Christ, as was the Souldiers their bowing of knees before him, yet a taking the name of God in vain. Seeing all significations of honour, in Gods Service, ought to be to the honour of his Name, and an Oath not religiously intended (as in the nature thereof it ought to be) to the Honour of God, is the taking of Gods Name in vain. Did *Naaman* newly brought to the knowledge of God, attribute so much to bowing in the house of *Rimmon* when his Master leaned on him, so that it was not his voluntary Act? And shall we, who have had the *Gospel* long, kneeling by Institution and determination, in a principal part of Gods Service, make no account whether we Honour *GOD*, or no, by such kneeling?

Matth. 27. 29. Mal. 1. 6, 7.

Jer. 4. 2.

2 Kings 5. 18.

3. If *Kneeling* be instituted for a more reverent receiving, then it must be either in regard of God, or of Bread and Wine; If in regard of *God* then must we be well perswaded that such kneeling is an acceptable service unto his Majesty. And that this may be, we must consider, whether such kneeling be a Will-worship or a service reasonable, and according to Gods Will. Least otherwise we

Rom. 12. 1. & 14, 15, 23. Isa. 19. 13. Matth. 15. 9.

we finde our ſelves ſo far from honouring God, as that we provoke him. As did *Nadab* and *Abihu*, who offered incenſe, but not with the very fire which God appointed, and were therefore devoured with fire. Levit. 10. 1, 2, 3. And as did King *David*, and the Prieſts, who carried the Arke otherwiſe than it ought to have been, and therefore *Uzza* died for it, with a ſodain death. 1 Chron. 13. 10. & 15. 12, 13. For God will be ſanctified (if not *by*, *yet*) in all them that come neer him.

4. But kneeling is contrary to the example of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, who miniſtred and received ſitting, or in ſuch a geſture as in thoſe Countreys was moſt uſed at eating. Luke 22. 14. From which example to differ, without warrrant from Gods word cannot be without fault. Seeing examples of holy men, much more of Chriſt, are to be followed, except there be ſome reaſonable cauſe to the contrary. 1 Cor. 11. 1. And the Apoſtle to reform an abuſe which crept (even in their times) into Love-feaſts, which were immediately before, or after the Lords Supper, did baniſh them thence, and reduced the manner of adminiſtring the Lords Supper to the firſt inſtitution, ſaying; *Shall I praiſe you in this? I praiſe you not. For I have received of the Lord that which I have alſo delivered unto you, &c.* 1 Cor. 11. 22, 23. Whereby it is apparent, that, that forme of Adminiſtration, which differeth from the firſt Inſtitution, is worthy no praiſe, and therefore no acceptable ſervice to God. For if the Apoſtle would not tolerate an indifferent thing (as was a Love-feaſt till then) to continue ſo near the Lords Supper, when it was abuſed, how would they allow the change of ſitting into kneeling, eſpecially in theſe two conſiderations?

First, becauſe the abuſe of love feaſts, (*viz. ſuperfluity*) was never ſo great, and ſcandalous, in the Apoſtles time, as the abuſe of *kneeling* (viz. *Idolatry*) was and is in the ſynagogue of *Rome*: And beſides, Love-feaſts were either before, or after the Lords Supper, whereas kneeling is in the principal part of the holy Communion. Therefore if the Apoſtle baniſhed Love-feaſts from the Lords Supper, becauſe of the abuſe, and brought the Church to the ſimplicity of the firſt Inſtitution, is it not a tempting ſin to retain the idolatrous kneeling of Papiſts, and reject the exemplary ſitting of our M. Chriſt? And the rather, becauſe it is in that Sacrament, and in that part of the Sacrament, which eſpecially ſetteth forth our communion with Chriſt, and his Church, and is therefore called *The Communion*. 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. In due conſi-

deration

deration whereof, how can we imagine that *Christ* hath any honour by our kneeling? Seeing it swerveth, not onely from his example, but also from the practise of all reformed Churches, except in *England*, which the papists themselves call *Puritan-Papistical*, for retaining this, and other popish corruptions: and, seeing it may be an argument (especially to a Papist not understanding our tongue) that we have communion with *Antichrist*, and his synagogue, at least in the idolatry of Bread-worship. Which our failing, or carelesnes to avow our communion with Christ and his Church, and not abhorring all communion with Antichrist and his synagogue cannot be without grievous sin. Or else *Paul* sinned, when he rebuked *Peter* for not holding communion with the *Gentiles* converted, and wrote without good warrant, where he saith; *If any lust to be contentious, we have no such custome, neither the Churches of God.* And in another place: *What communion hath Christ with Belial? Come out, and touch no unclean thing.* Doth not God streightly forbid us to serve him as Idolaters do their gods? These things considered, can kneeling wherewith Papists do honour their breaden God, be honourable to Christ, in his holy Sacrament?

Concertatio Ecclesiæ Cathol. in Angl.

Gal. 2. 11, 12.

1 Cor. 11. 16.
2 Cor. 6. 15, 17
Deut. 12. 30, 31.

6. Secondly, whereas the end of a Sacrament is to inform the outward man, by sensible demonstrations, it pleased our Mr. Christ, to use such a gesture, as, agreeably with bread and wine, setteth out our communion and spirituall familiarity with him, and rejoycing in him. And therefore as he saith, *If any hear my voyce, and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me*: So he saith, *Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit with Abraham*, &c. By which place it appeareth that as by *Supper*, so by *sitting*, *familiar rejoycing*, or *rejoycing familiarity* is expressed. In which respects the Communion is called the *Lords Supper* and not a *Sacrifice*, and we are said to be *partakers of the Lords table*, and not of an *Altar*. And therefore not kneeling, and sitting is for receiving. We read not of any gesture of body prescribed, or observed in Circumcision and Baptisme as in the Passeover and Lords Supper. Because there needs no material regard to be had of any certain gesture in the two former Sacraments, so the foreskin were cut off, and water be used: But in the other two, a gesture, answerable to the action is requisite. And therefore God-prescribed to his people:

Revel. 3. 20.

Matth. 8. 11.

1 Cor. 11. 2. & 10. 21.

Exod. 12. 11.

people: when they were to flye out of *Egypt*, the gesture of loynes girded, and staves in their hands, because the eating then of the Passeover was in hast. But that gesture being but for that time, as may appear by the omission thereof, when the observation of the Passeover was established, our Mr. Christ, who came not to break but fulfill the Law, and knew what was fittest to be done, did eat the Passeover sitting, a gesture more answerable to eating in peace, than the former used in *Egypt*. Whereby kneeling is convinced, as being a gesture altogether unanswerable to eating. And the rather, because it darkneth the counsell of God, and being a signe of the greatest submission obscureth that rejoycing familiarity, which the Lords Supper signifieth and sealeth. Do we not condemn the Papists for ministring the Communion in one kinde, because such an administration is against Christ his example, and doth not lively demonstrate the Lords death? Here a caveat is to be given, that none take occasion by this discourse, to justifie the childish Pedagogy of signifying ceremonies devised by man, seeing sitting was used by Christ, and the signification thereof is found in Scripture. And therefore that childish Pedagogy is not justified by that worthy servant of Christ, Mr. *Cartwright* his judgement, *viz.* That sitting doth signifie our rest in *Christ Jesus*.

Num. 9.3. 11, 12. Matth. 5.17 & 26.20.

Job 38. 2. 1 Cor. 11.25, 26.

7. That kneeling may be more soundly convinced as a will-worship, objections are to be answered. Therefore where it is supposed that Christ and his Apostles ministred and received sitting but by occasion, and not of purpose: because they were sitting before in eating the Passeover. Whereas if Christ had sitten down of purpose to administer the Communion, then all that is said is granted to be some purpose. The answer is short, yet full: Christ did sit of purpose, when he ministred his last Supper. For after the Passeover he rose, washed his Disciples feet, and sate down again.

8. If it be demanded, why the Church is not bound to the time of evening, as well as to the gesture of sitting, sith Christ observed the one, as well as the other? It may be answered; Time being a common circumstance to every action (for nothing can be done, but in some time) the particular time is not to be observed, except Christ had sanctified it to the communion, as God sanctified the 7th day, on which he rested, or (at least) chosen it of purpose, as he did *sitting*. But whereas it was

John 13.4.12.

Gen. 2.2,3.

upon

Matth. 26. 31. 45. Luke 22. 53. upon ſpeciall, and neceſſary occaſion, for the Paſſeover muſt be eaten before the L. Supper could be inſtituted in ſtead thereof: and preſently after Supper the hour came, when Chriſt was to be betrayed. Therefore if the *Jews* tranſgreſſed not the Inſtitution of the Paſſeover, by changing a geſture, at the firſt preſcribed by God according to that their preſent occaſion, into another fitter for a time of reſt, much leſs do Chriſtians tranſgreſs the inſtitution of the Lords Supper, by changing the time taken by Chriſt upon occaſion, but not preſcribed, into ſome other fitter (in diſcretion) for the ordinary celebration of the Lords Supper, as probably the Primitive Churches did. For every firſt day of the week (*viz.* the Lords day) the brethren came together to break bread, *i. e. to miniſter the Communion.* So that either they never met upon the L. day, but in the evening, or elſe they celebrated the Communion at ſome other times. But for my alteration of the geſtures of ſitting, eſpecially into kneeling, there is the leaſt probability.

Acts 2. 42. & 20. 7. 1 Cor. 16. 2. Revel. 1. 10

It is further objected; That we may kneel in regard of prayers to be uſed by preſcription of authority, at the delivering of the bread and wine, *viz. The body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which was given for thee, preſerve thy body and ſoule into eternall life, and take and eate this*, &c. Here unto theſe anſwers may be returned; Seeing we reject Chriſts example of ſitting for kneeling, we muſt not ſtand upon what we may do, but humbly conſider what we *muſt do.* For if there be not a neceſſary and a juſtifiable cauſe both of thoſe prayers, and of kneeling in regard of them, do we not preſume upon Chriſt's patience, in rejecting his example? Now, what neceſſity is there of thoſe prayers, at that very time? ſeeing prayers go before, and follow after. Again, muſt we needs kneel at every bit of a prayer? Is there more neceſſity to obey a needleſs direction to kneel at thoſe prayers, than to follow the example of Chriſt, in ſitting when we take, eat and drink, things required in the ſame ſentences preſcribed? And why muſt the people kneel, when they hear thoſe prayers, rather then the Miniſter who pronounceth them? But it is a queſtion, whether thoſe prayers be juſtifiable or no. For beſides that, by reaſon of them, *Kneeling*, deviſed and abuſed by Antichriſt, doth croſs the practice of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and they may ſeem a vain repetition: Even the adding of them to the words of Inſtitution is contrary to the mind of Chriſt. For he

Mat. 6. 7. & 26. 26. &c.

did

did first bleſſe or pray, and after gave the Elements, in a Sacramentall forme of words, without any addition, ſaying, *take, eat,* &c. Which order of adminiſtration, and form of words, *Matthew, Marke, Luke,* and *Paul* do ſo conſtantly, preciſely, and ſincerely related that any may perceive the meaning of the ſpirit to be. That the ſacramental form of words ought preciſely to be obſerved, without any addition. And the rather, becauſe *Paul* beginneth his relation thus; *I have received of the Lord that which I have alſo delivered,* &c. So that it may ſeem to be againſt Religion and Reaſon, that to a ſacramentall forme of ſpeech, wherein the Miniſter ſhould onely ſupply the perſon of Chriſt, there ſhould be added a prayer, as in the name of the Church. This confuſion is fitter for *Babylon,* than for *Sion.*

Mark 14.21. Luke 22.19, &c. 1 Cor. 11.23, 24.

Laſtly, Why is not a ſhort prayer, after other going before as well joyned to the ſacramentall forme of Baptiſme: *viz.* N. *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father,* &c. If then this addition of Prayer to the ſacramentall forme of words, be not of faith, how then can we, with faith and a good conſcience, confirm, or allow the ſame with our kneeling?

Rom. 14.5.23.

10. Laſtly, for juſtifying of *Kneeling*, it is affirmed; That it is indifferent whether we ſit, ſtand, or kneel: ſeeing *Chriſt* did ſit, when he did eat the Paſſeover. Whereas God commanded the children of *Iſrael* in *Egypt* to eate the *Paſſeover* ſtanding, and ſome Reformed Churches receive ſtanding; for all that Chriſt did ſit at his laſt Supper: Therefore the KING may appoint *Kneeling*, as the moſt reverent geſture, and beſt beſeeming ſo holy an action. For anſwer whereunto, howſoever that which is already ſaid may ſuffice. Yet it may be further conſidered, that though it be admitted, that it is indifferent to ſit, or to ſtand, yet it doth not follow, that *Kneeling* is indifferent. For *ſitting* is the example, and *ſtanding* is a geſture ſometimes uſed in ordinary eating, and (in the objection) it is ſaid to be preſcribed at a Sacramentall feaſt.

Again, it doth not follow; That becauſe Chriſt uſed a geſture fitter for eating in his time, inſtead of a geſture preſcribed upon occaſion, it is therefore lawfull to uſe a geſture nothing anſwerable to eating, and that taken out of the *Synagogue* of *Antichriſt* (as though the Word of God came out of it, or to it onely) inſtead of a geſture moſt anſwerable to eating, and

1 Cor. 14.36.

of purpoſe uſed by Chriſt at the Inſtitution of the Sacrament. So that, notwithſtanding all that is ſaid for Kneeling, His Majeſtie (upon whom the burthen as of this geſture, ſo of other Ceremonies, is layd) may remember, That *Hezekiah* appointed *Levites* in the houſe of the Lord, with Cimbals, &c. according to the commandement of *David*, and *Gad* the Kings Seer, and *Nathan* the Prophet, for the commandement was by the hand of the Lord, and by the hand of his Prophets. And withall conſider, that if *Kneeling* were the moſt reverent geſture, and beſt beſeeming the holy Communion, our Lord and Maſter would not have ſitten down of purpoſe, at his laſt ſupper. And that *Ahaz* was deceived in deeming the Altar at *Damaſcus* more honourable for Gods ſervice, than the Altar of the Lord.

2 Chro. 29. 25.

2 King. 16. 10, 12. 14. 15.

11. Having ſaid that which may be ſufficient to a man reaſonable, and not contentious, againſt the inſtitution of kneeling for ſuppoſed reverence in regard of God, it remaineth that ſomewhat be ſaid againſt the inſtitution of *Kneeling*, for reverence in regard of bread and wine, which need not to be much. For no ſound Proteſtant of any knowledge, will affirme it, but rather preſently conſider, That if kneeling be inſtituted for reverence in regard of bread and wine, it muſt be either becauſe they repreſent the body and blood of Chriſt, though remaining bread and wine touching their ſubſtance; And then for like reaſon, we may worſhip the Crucifix, and image of God, as the Papiſts do: Or, becauſe Chriſt is really, bodily, and locally, though inviſibly, preſent in them, either by *Tranſubſtantiation*, according to the hereſie of the Papiſts, or by *Conſubſtantiation*, according to the hereſie of the *Lutherans*. Theſe things cannot but be conſidered: And then it muſt needs follow, that if we abjure theſe hereſies of Papiſts, and *Lutherans*, we muſt alſo abhor idolatrous, and ſuperſtitious kneeling, their *daughter* and *Nurſe*, which was never heard of before *Tranſubſtantiation* was hatched in the ſynagogue of *Antichriſt*. So that immediately after Pope *Innocent* decreed *Tranſubſtantiation*, Pope *Honorius* decreed kneeling. Therefore if *Harding* doth grant that it is not well to kneel, but in regard of a reall, and bodily preſence; a ſound Proteſtant ſhould infer; But I deteſt your reall preſence, therefore I abhor your Idolatrous kneeling.

Reliques of Rome, fol. 98. & 99.

Anſw. to Mr. Juels challenge, fol. 111.

12. We

12. We are to abhor kneeling, not onely becauſe we abhor the hereſies of worſhipping Images, Tranſubſtantiation, and Conſubſtantiation, but alſo, becauſe it is the ſhow of the greateſt evils that ever were, *viz. Idolatry* in worſhipping a God made of a piece of bread, and of communion with Antichriſt, rather than with Chriſt; and therefore the greateſt ſcandall that ever was, or can be, both in regard of thoſe evils it doth occaſionally teach, or confirme, as alſo in regard of multitudes (indeed the moſt part of people) either not ſufficiently inſtructed in the right underſtanding, and uſe of the Sacrament, and therefore carried with a blind devotion learned by tradition, or corrupted (more or leſſe) with the leaven of Popery. Who all in regard of their weakneſſe, are endangered by this geſture, either groſly to commit the Idolatry of Papiſts, or to have a ſuperſtitious eſtimation of the outward Elements. And the rather, becauſe by the 21 Canon it is provided: *That no bread, and wine newly brought, ſhall be uſed, but firſt the words of Inſtitution ſhall be rehearſed, when the ſaid bread and wine be preſent upon the Communion Table.* As if the words were Incantations, and the Table like the Altar which ſanctifieth the Sacrifice. May not this *Proviſo* ſeem (at leaſt to the ſimple) to make way at leaſt to the Popiſh conſecration? How grievous a ſin it is to ſcandalize the weak, may appeare by the words of Chriſt, viz. *Whoſoever ſhall offend one of theſe little ones, it were better for him, that a mil-ſtone were hanged about his necke, and that he were drowned in the midſt of the Sea.* And of *Paul*: *If meate offend my brother, I will eat no fleſh, while the world ſtandeth, that I may not offend my brother.* What an offence or ſcandall is, the Apoſtle ſheweth in the ſame Chapter, *viz. An occaſion of falling to the weake.* The particular offence he ſpeaketh of is this: Notwithſtanding the Goſpell was preached a convenient time, and that by the Apoſtles, yet many wanted knowledge, and, even unto that time, did eat as a thing ſacrificed to an Idoll. Of whom if any ſhould ſee a man endued with knowledge ſit at Table in the Idols Temple, his weak conſcience might occaſionally be imboldened to eat thoſe things which are ſacrificed to Idols. If *Paul* would never eat fleſh rather then he would offend in this caſe, becauſe in ſo doing he ſhould ſinne againſt Chriſt; how dare a Chriſtian, having knowledge, kneel in the

1 Theſ. 5. 22.

Matth 18. 6.

1 Cor. 8. 13.

Verſe 9.

Verſe 7. 10.

Verſe 12.

the presence of any, who, for want of knowledge, receive superstitiously. Of which sort, seeing there be so many even until this hour, and ever likely to be, than we know not when, and where to communicate without some such, either old or young: It followeth, that as sitting at Table in the Idols Temple, could not be without sinne, in the Apostles time, so kneeling cannot be without sin in these dayes, when the number of faithfull Teachers is much decreased, but of Papists much increased, and by our kneeling much confirmed in their Bread-worship. Therefore if his Majesties judgement be found, that the Surplice is not to be worn, if *Heathenish men were commorant amongst us, who, thereby, might take occasion to be strengthened in their paganisme?* Shall we by our corrupt practice of *kneeling*, strengthen the Papists, who swarm among us in their Idolatry?

Sum of the confession. p. 74.

Rob. after the com. Sect. 5.

If the State doth well, in ordaining the Sacrament to be administred in usuall bread to take away superstition, whereas Christ did by occasion, minister in unleavened bread, shall not we do ill, in teaching, or confirming superstition by kneeling, whereas Christ did of purpose minister sitting? setting up of Images in Churches onely to be Lay-mens books, is, by authority condemned, because they are as *stumbling blocks in the way of the blinde: So that they have been, are still, and will be hereafter worshipped by ignorant persons.* Is not kneeling as scandalous? How can it then be justified?

Hom. against peril of Idol. part 3.

Levit. 19. 14.

But is said, that the Kings commandement taketh away scandal, in things indifferent. And it may be averred that this is a begging of the question, except it be proved by the word, that kneeling may be without sin, and that notwithstanding it be an institution of man, contrary to the example of Christ, a signe of communion rather with Antichrist and his sinagogue of *Rome*, than which Christ and his Church, it have no proportion with sacramental eating, and have been, is, and will be bread-worship. But suppose that in it self it were as indifferent as was eating of flesh sacrificed to an Idol, not in the Idols Temple, but at a private table where no weak ones were, in the Apostles time: yet how doth the Kings commandement take away scandal from kneeling in publick places? Doth it make all so sure, that none can be scandalized? Or, if that cannot be, doth it take

1 Cor. 10. 27, 28.

take away guiltines from the scandalizer, as if all the blame of scandalizing, were in the Kings commandement? Surely it must be in the former, or els the latter cannot be, for by scandalizing a weak brother perisheth. Of whose bloud the scandalizer is guilty, as *Ioab* was of *Vriahs* bloud, notwithstanding the Kings commandement. Here his Majestie known to be of a gentle disposition, and to have learned, yea professed better things in *Scotland*, is most humbly prayed, to take this word (King) as spoken in imitation, and understood of *Cantor*: who knowne to be of a violent disposition, did carry matters in the Convocation, and published Canons not orderly, and fully concluded, as some of his suffragane prelates report, *But* it is impossible, that the Kings commandement should make all so sure that none can be scandalized, the general ignorance of the people, the disposition, of the ignorant unto superstition, the old leaven of popery not purged and the multiplying of *Papists*, all well considered. Nay rather, It is likely, that by the commandement the scandal will be the greater. Especially in regard of the 27 Canon, where ministers are commanded, under pain of *suspension*, *not wittingly to administer the sacrament to any, but such as kneel.* May not simple, and superstitious persons take occation thus to argue? Why should kneeling be thus urged by authority, if the sacramental signes of the body, and bloud of Christ, be no more to be reverenced, than water applyed in baptizing children? Seeing that is also a sanctified signe of Christ his bloud, that washeth away our sins, and iniquities.

1 Cor. 8. 11. Numb. 35. 37. 2 Sam. 11. 15. 16, 17.

To conclude, If *kneeling* in the very act of *taking, eating, and drinking* the sacramental bread and wine, in the holy communion, be (1) an institution of man. (2) If it be the taking of of Gods name in vain, when it is without all respect of reverence (3) If God be not honoured thereby, except it be according to his will. (4) If it swarve from the example of Christ his sitting, and therefore deserveth no praise. (4) If it be a provoking sin to reject the exemplary sitting of Christ, whereby we shew our selves to be in communion with Christ, and the reformed Churches; and to retain kneeling, which for bread-worship, ought to be banished, and whereby we seem to be in communion with Antichrist, and his synagogue. (6) If it obscureth that rejoycing familiaritie in and with Christ which the

Lords

Lords ſupper ſignifieth. (7) If the argument from Chriſt his example be made the ſtronger, in that he ſat of purpoſe. (8) If the lawfulneſs of chuſing a fitter time than the evening cannot juſtifie our rejecting Chriſt his exemplary ſitting. (9) If the bits of prayer joyned with the words of inſtitution do make kneeling the more ſinfull. (10) If kneeling be not as indifferent, as ſtanding, nor beſt beſeeming the holy communion, and the King muſt appoint nothing but by the hand of the Lord. (11) If we ought to abhor kneeling, as we abhor the worſhipping of Images, *Tranſubſtantiation*, and *Conſubſtantiation*. (12) If to ſcandalize be grievouſly to ſin, and kneeling be a ſhew of the greateſt evils, and withall the greateſt ſcandal. And (13) If it be a begging of the queſtion to affirm, kneeling to be indifferent, and the Kings commandement (ſo called) doth rather increaſe, than leſſen ſcandal by kneeling, It may be averred, that kneeling in the very act of Taking, eating, and drinking the ſacramental bread and wine, in the holy communion, cannot be without ſin.

A SHORT

TREATISE

OF THE

CROSSE in BAPTISME

Contracted into this

SYLLOGISME.

No religious use of a Popish Idol, in Gods publique service is indifferent, but utterly unlawfull:
But the use of the Cross in Baptisme is a religious use of a Popish Idol in Gods publique service.

Ergo.

The use of the Cross in Baptism is not indifferent but utterly unlawfull.

Printed in the yeare 1660.

Of the Signe of the Croſs in Baptiſm.

The uſe of the Croſs in Baptiſme is not a thing indifferent, but vtterly unlawfull. For this reaſon.

Proſe of the Major.

IT is againſt the Apoſtles precept 1. *John* 5, 21. *Babes keep your ſelves from Idolls.* For the explanation whereof two things are to be ſcanned firſt: what is meant by an Idol. Secondly: how far we are to keep our ſelves from the Idol. An Idol is whatſoever beſides God is worſhipped with divine honour. And though ſome reſtrain an Idol to a viſible form, becauſe it is derived *apo tou eidaos* yet, as a learned writer obſerveth (*a*) They which will treat of all ſorts of Idolatrie, muſt needs take the name of an Idol in a larger ſignification. By the name therefore of an Idoll is underſtood whatſoever beſides the true God a man doth propoſe or frame to himſelfe to be worſhipped, either ſimplie, or in ſome reſpect.

(*a*) Zanch de redemp, lib. 1. cap. 17. Theſ. 5.

Neither is this ſpoken without good reaſon, for nothing is properly an Idol, as it is a viſible form, but as it is religiouſly worſhipped. If therefore it be worſhipped it may be an Idoll, though it be no viſible ſhape, otherwiſe the worſhipping of Angels and the ſouls of juſt men were no Idolatrie, ſeeing theſe are inviſible ſpirits, and therefore the ſigne of the Croſs If it be religouſly worſhipped, may prove an Idol though it be *tranſiens quiddam* a thing vaniſhing in the Ayre and no permanent form. For as that learned Zanchy ſpeaketh there is a two fold Idol, the one real the other imaginary, conceived only in the mind.

How far we to keep our ſelves from an Idol.

For anſwer to the ſecond queſtion. Men may keep themſelves from Idols two waves: viz. *a cultu, & ab uſu Idoli*: from the worſhip, and from the uſe of the Idol.

(*b*) 1 Cor. 10. 15 10. 13.

For the firſt, (*b*) S. *Paul* is ſo ſtrict that he alloweth not the Chriſtians ſo much as to be preſent in the Temple at the Idolatrous feaſts, though they did it without any internal opinion, or external action of worſhipping the Idol.

But John in this place doth not ſpeak ſo much of the worſhip as

he

the use of the Idoll for (as Aug. in psa. 113. well obserueth) the Apostle commandeth that they avoid not only the the worship of the Images, but also the Images or Idols themselves.

Now the use of an Image, or Idol, may be civil or religious, and both of them publick or private.

That an Image, even such an Image as is Idolatrously worshipped, may be made and retayned for civill respects of ornament, story or such like: we make no question, though the tolerating of them in open and publick places, even *extra cultum*, be offensive and turn into a snare, as Gideons Ephod was to his posteritie, when it was abused to Idolatrie. And upon this ground we yeild, that though the Crosse be apparently an Idoll, yet in Princes Banners, Coronations, Coyn, Crown, or any other Civil respect it may have a lawfull use: But that any thing of mans devising being worshipped as an Idol, should be used *religionis*, ergo: and in the worship of God, seemeth directly against S. *Johns* precept, for, how do I keep my self from the Idoll, or how do I shew my zealous detestation of that filthy Idolatry, when I retayn it, and use it so honourably, as in the Temple, in the Sanctuary; in the service of God. Which interpretation of this place of S. *John*, the Church of *England* (c) doth on the warrant of *Tertullian* approve and commend.

And this poynt is further strengthened by the second commandement: which forbiddeth not only to worship, but even to make an Image, or any similitude whatsoever, to wit, *ad cultum*, or for religious use: as according to the Scripture the best interpretors, (d) partly against Images in Churches, partly on the words of the precept, do most naturally expound it. For surely, if Idolatry it self, as a most execrable thing be forbidden, then all occasions and means leading thereunto are likewise prohibited. And what stronger provocation to that spirituall whordome, then erecting Images in the place of Gods worship? For as *Augustine* well obserueth, in *Psal.* 113. Idols or Images, have greater power to corrupt a silly soul, in that they have a mouth, eyes, eares nose, hands, feet, then to correct it, in that they neither heare, smell, &c.

And therefore without doubt, the meaning of the commandement is to binde the Church from all such snares and allurements to sin, and therfore doth *Aug.* in *quæst. sup. Levit. q.* 68. well conclude from this commandement, that such making of an Idol can never be just or lawfull.

Now if no similitude at all be tollerable in Gods service, then much

(c) Homil against peril of Idolatry part 2. Exod. 23. & 34 13, Deut. 7, 5, Psa. 16. 4.

(d) Calvin. instit. lib. 1 cap. 11, Ursin cathe. in expos. secundi. precept. Pet. Martyr loc com. cla. 2. cad. 5. sect. 22 Hooper in 2 precept Zanch. de redempt lib. 1. cap. 15. Bagington on the 2 commandement. Perk. sermon cause cap. 21 Allen on the 2 com. Dod on the 2. com.

much less any that hath been and is worshipped Idolatrously. *Tertullian* against the *Gnosticks* accounted them Idolaters, not only which worshipped, but those also which made and retained Images (*nempe ad cultum* or for holy use) & in his Book *de Idololatria*, he vehemently reproved the very makers of Images, though they did not themselves worship them, which sheweth in what execration the primitive Churches held any religious use of an Idol.

The like we may find in *Epiphanius ad Johannem Epum Hierosal.* where he reporteth, that finding an Image of Christ, or some Saint, hanging at a Church dore, he rent it in peices, avouching that to hang a picture in the Church of Christ, was contrary to the authority of the Scriptures and the Christian religion.

From hence I conclude, that if the godly fathers were so vehement, against erecting Images of Christ, and of the Saints, even at that time before any worship was given unto them; Much more would they withstand it now, after men have made Idols of them. And if they would not suffer an Idol so much as in the place of Gods worship: would they endure themselves to use such an Idol as the Cross in the service and sacraments of God. Their zeal against that spiritual fornication, would never permit them so highly to honour, such an execrable thing neither was their zeal herein without ground of knowledge: for the spirit of God in psal. 115. 8 speaking of Idolls, they (saith he) that make them are like unto them, and so are all they that trust in them Where a plain difference is made between makers and worshippers of Idols and both condemned, as cursed transgressors of the law, shall any then make the Idoll of the Crosse, and that *for religious use*: and yet be innocent?

Hsa. 16. 14

Isa. 30. 22.

Questionless by Davids example we must make no mention, that is to keep no honorable memory of an Idol, and therefore without donbt, not give it so much honor as to use it, or the memorial thereof in the house of God, and in his holy worship, but as *Isai* saith, we must pollute the reliques and the very covering, and ornament of the Idol, and cast them away as a menstrous cloth, and say unto it, get thee hence.

Prose of the Minor.

Now if any doubt, whether the signe of the *Crosse* be adored, and so made an Idol: let them well consider the tract of *Bellarmine, de adoratione crucis*, where distinguishing the *Cross* on which Christ was hanged, from the similitude thereof, he saith: other crosses like to this are accounted sacred images.

And

And after he diſtinguiſheth thoſe ſimilitudes of Chriſts *Croſs*, into the Image, and ſigne of the Croſs, ſo that if the Image of the Croſſe be taken for an Idoll (and who knoweth not that it is the univerſall Idoll of popery: and to be adored, even *cultu latriæ* (which worſhip as they themſelves hold, is due only unto God): the ſigne of the Croſs muſt needs be taken for no better. Beſides, the ſaid *Bellarmine* having (as is ſaid) diſtinguiſhed the Croſs into three ſorts, the true Croſs, the Image of the Croſs, and the ſigne of the Croſs: he layeth down this doctrine generally of them all, we adore all croſſes, and particulerly, of the ſigne of the Croſs he ſaith

De Image lib. 2. 30.

The ſigne of the Croſs which is made in the forehead, or in the ayr, is ſacred and venerable. To this agreeth *Portiforium Sariſb.* 4. where it is thus profeſſed, *we adore the ſigne of the Croſs, by which we have received the Sacrament of Salvation.*

And that the Image and ſigne of the Croſs is of one, and the ſame account with Papiſts, appeareth evidently as by divers, ſo particularly by Hart. For Doctor *Reynolds* (*e*) ſhewing that the Church of *England*, hath juſtly left the ſigne of the *Croſſe* out of the ſupper for the Idolatry thereof, doth prove that it is worſhipped as an Idol, by ſuch teſtimonies as indeed belong to the Image of the Croſs, which Hart no way excepting againſt, doth imply, that look what eſtimation they have of the Image, the ſame they have of the ſigne, and what honour is due to the one is due to the other. For in very deed, they carefully teach, that it is not in regard of the matter, wherein the Croſs is painted, or the colour whereby it is ſhadowed, but only and ſimply for the expreſſing of the likeneſs of Chriſts croſs, and for the repreſenting of Chriſt crucified (which the ſigne performeth as well as the Image) that they adore the croſs with the ſame honor, that is due unto Chriſt himſelf. And this no doubt was the meaning of *Aquinas* when he ſaith, that every *effigies* or likeneſs of the croſs (whereof the ſigne is one) is to be adored *cultu latriæ*, and *Coſterus* doth avouch, that the ſame worſhip is due to the ſigne, as belongeth to the very croſſe of Chriſt, when he ſaith (though falſly (*f*) *The Chriſtians from Chriſts time hither unto have worſhipped with the higheſt honor, both the Wood of the Lords croſſe, and the ſigne of the Croſſe, with which they dayly fence themſelves.* Mark, that the ſigne of the croſſe is worſhipped with the higheſt degree of honor, and as *Andradius*, (*g*) in expreſs words ſaith, in the ſame manner, that the Image of Chriſt himſelf is worſhipped, then the which, what can be

Confer. with *Hart, cap. 8. diviſ. 4.*

Andra Orthod. expli. lib. 9. Bellarmine de imag. lib. 2. cap. 30. Tho. Aquin. part. 3. queſt. 2 art 4. and divers other. *ibidem.*

Coſter Enchri cap. 11. Orthod. expliæ. lib. 9.

more clear to prove, that not only the Image, but the signe of the crosse is by the Papists most *Idolatrously* worshipped.

If any say: that to the signe of the crosse none boweth the knee, or vaileth the bonnet, and therefore it is not adored: *I* answer first that adoration is *interne & externe*, and the extern adoration is therefore Idolatrie, because it proceedeth from the intern, as *Zanchius* (h) very learnedly, and largely sheweth.

Zanc. de redemp. lib. 1. cap 17. Thes. 5. Eph. 5. 6. Colos. 5. Mark 10. 24. 1 Tim. 6. 19. Luke 12. 15. Phil. 3. 19.

If a man invocate to an Angel, or give any honour internal to a creature, shall it not be called Idolatry except he bow outwardly unto it? How then doth *Paul* say, that covetousnes is Idolatry? For a rich man doth not outwardly worship his goods, yet because he giveth unto it intern confidence which is due unto God, it is truly called his Idol, as unto the Sardanapali. (q) their belly is termed their God. Right so the Papists ascribing to the signe of the Crosse, that honor and confidence which belongeth to God, do make it an execrable Idol, and so most unfit to stand in the sanctuary, or to be annexed to the holy things of God. For first they ascribe unto the signe of the crosse power and vertue, to merit pardon at least for venial sins as appeareth by (k) *Tho. Aquinas*, *Bellarmine*, and *Rhemists*:

Quest. disput. de venal pecc. de effect. Sacrament. lib. 2. 1 Tim. 4. sect. 13 14. Bellar. de effect. sacra. lib. 2. cap. 31.

Also it is held to partake of power efficient, and immediately (l) operative, and that to convert sinners, *Martial de cruce, fol.* 114, 115. Yea to gain salvation, *Hosius contra Brent.* pag. 227. saith unto a rude Clown whose dull understanding cannot reach to higher things, this onely (saith he) sufficeth for his salvation; and generally the whole rabble of Romish Doctors do teach to put great affiance in this signe for chasing away Devils, and curing diseases, and sanctifying both man and other creatures, to the use of man.

Secondly, I say indeed they do give outward, as well as inward worship to the cros. For it is apparent that they invocate it in the same manner, that they invocate Saints when they say, *by this sign of holy cros let evils all flie far from us* Again, *by the sign of the holy cros, from our enemies deliver us O Lord our God.* Also in another place, *victorious cros and admirable sign, make us triumph and joy, in heavenly Courts divine.* Yea in prayers they joyn it with Jesus Christ, as in *Officio missæ* is to be seen, where they supplicate: *By the mercy of Jesus Christ, by the aide and sign of the cros, by the intercession of the blessed Virgin, &c.* They couple it also with the blood of Christ in these words; *Defend me Jesu, from all evil vices past, present, and to come, by the sign of holy cros: and by the inestimable price of thy just and precious blood.*

In officio sanct. cruce, printed in English Anno 1599.

Liber. precum usum Sarum Parisus impres. Anno 1498.

All

All which doth most manifestly prove, that among the Papists, it is religiously honoured both with inward confidence, and outward reverence. And therefore if their Idols may in no sort be annexed to the service of our God, the crosse in Baptism ought necessarily to be crossed and cursed out of our Liturgy. Neither is it a sufficient answer to say, that the crosse amongst us is neither in number nor in use, the same that theirs is, and though their crosse be an Idoll, yet ours is not. For when God commanded his people to break down the Images of the Heathen, and to extinguish the very name of them, had they performed that charge, if they had burnt all the Idolls of *Canaan*, and afterward made new of the same form, and to another use though not Idolatrous, yet religious? Or how have we discharged our duties and shewed our detestation of that filthy Idolatry, if having defaced all the popish Crucifixes and Idolls, we erect them new in our Church though not to Worship them, yet to any other holy use whatsoever. It is true that our crosse, and theirs is the same both in name, & form, but not in use, for then it were Idolatrous; now I do not say that the Church of *England* doth commit Idolatry, but that it ought to abstain not onely from Idolatry or Worship, but even from all religious use of such humane Ordinances and inventions, which others have and do Idolatrously adore. For if to erect Crucifixes, and other Popish Images for holy use be (contrary to the Commandement) a keeping of an honourable memory of the Idoll, how can the religious use of the crosse in Baptism being as well an Idoll as any of their Images, be retained without breach of the Law, *Babes keep your selves from Idolls.*

Exod. 23 13. Deut. 12.2. Hos. 2 17.

Objection.

The signe of the crosse in the first institution was free from superstition and Idolatry, and if the abuse which grew after be removed, why should it not recover his ancient use and indifferency, like as the Bread in the Lords Supper which the Papists do religiously adore?

Of this nature are Churches, Pulpets, &c. things of necessary use and warranted by God himself but the reteyning of the Brazen Serpent was no where commanded.

Answer.

There is great difference between that which God hath created and commanded, and that which man hath ordained, for the one is necessary, and no abuse can alter the nature of it, the other indifferent, and by abuse may become unlawful, and therefore *Hezekiah* did worthily break the brazen Serpent, not seeking to redress the abuse of it. Now howsoever *Bellarmine* would insinu-

ate

ate that the crosse is founded on Scripture, yet the weaknesse of his Arguments do bewray the unsoundnesse of the matter, and therefore *Tertullians* judgement is to be preferred, which plainly saith, that there is no warrant in Scripture for it. His words be, (n) *If thou seek any Law for this in Scripture, thou shalt find none. Tradition is avouched to be the Author, Custom the Confirmer, and Faith the Observer.*

Aut enim signi crucis habere vim spiritualē potissimum ex institute Dei. lib. 2. *de effect. sacram & lib 2. de Imag. cap. 29 constat venerationem crucis Scripturæ auctoritate, stabilire de corona mil.*

Now it is further to be noted that a double use of the crosse is mentioned in antiquity, the one Civil, the other Religious, against the former we do not dispute, yeilding all reverence to those Christians, which by that note shewed their rejoycing and glory, in that which the Heathens counted their shame, but now, that abuse hath turned both the Image and the sign of the crosse into an Idoll, it seemeth thereby to be made execrable. For *Gideons* Ephod being first a Civil monument of victory, when the people went a whoring after it, was it lawful for the Magistrate to erect in the Tabernacle or Synagogue though not the same, yet the like, both in name and form to any religious use? would it have sufficed to say this is not the same Ephod that *Israel* maketh an Idoll of, neither is it set here to be worshipped (for your brethren do grievously sin therein) but onely to keep in mind the great victory that God by *Gideon* gave to *Israel*. Right so the crosse used by the Ancients, to shew that they were not ashamed of Christ crucified being meerely civil, and yet expressing a most Christian resolution, having been abused, yea, continuing to be worshipped both in Image and in sign, it seemeth that this filth hath made it unfit, on any pretence of restoring it to his ancient use, to be annexed to the holy things of the Sanctuary: especially while there are so many Papists that superstitiously abuse it among us. Now for the religious use of the crosse by the Ancients, it was never free from sin and superstition as afterwards is shewed, and if it were, yet being an humane Ordinance, and now not onely abused to Idolatry, but becoming it self a most abominable Idoll, no water can cleanse it, nor any pretext purifie it for the holy service of *Jehovah*. But in very deed, to speak as the truth is, the crosse is retained among us with opinion very superstitious and erronious, for in the late Canons it is said, that the child (c) is thereby dedicated unto the service of him that died on the crosse. What is this but to equal Mans Ordinance with Gods, and to ascribe that unto the crosse, which is due unto Baptism? a conceit fitter for ignorant Papists, then learned Christians to consent unto. Neither do we use it as the Ancients did, for *Cyprian*, *Augustin*, *Chrysostom*,

Canon. 30.

Tertullian de baptis. cap. 7, 8, Euseb. lib 6.

om and others, (m) it is apparent that thoſe times did conſecrate the Elements therewith, and did not croſs the childs fore-head at all, but referred that unto the Biſhops confirmation, ſo that our croſſing the *Infants* fore-head and not the Element of Baptiſm is a meere novelty without any warrant of that antiquity, neither will that place of Tertullian *De reſurrectione carnis*, prove the contrary. The fleſh is waſhed that the ſoul may be purged, the fleſh is annoynted that the ſoul may be conſecrated, the fleſh is ſigned that the ſoul may be guarded, the fleſh is ſhadowed by the Impoſition of hands, that the ſoul may be by the ſpirit inlightned, the fleſh doth feed on the body and blood of Chriſt, that the ſoul may be filled and fatted of God. In which words he joyning together divers ceremonies of the Chriſtians, doth indeed mention the ſigning of the faithful, but it may as well be referred to confirmation expreſſed by impoſition of hands as to Baptiſm, underſtood by the waſhing of the body and that one better reaſon, for it is more than probable that the ſign of the croſs was not yet uſed in Baptiſm, ſeeing *Juſtin Martyr* in defenſ. *ad Antoninum &* *Tertul. de Baptiſmo & de corona militis*, do deſcribe the form of Baptiſm uſed in thoſe times, and yet make no mention of the croſs therein, which in all likelihood they would not have omitted if it had been uſed therein, eſpecially *Tertullian*, who in that place ſpeaketh of the croſs, as uſed out of Baptiſm in the ordinary bleſſing of themſelves.

(m) *Cap 24. Innocint. 1. epiſt cap. 3. Rab. made inſtitut. cap. 3. Durand. de ritib. Eccle. lib. 1. cap. 20.*

Our uſe of the croſs.

Novelty of ſome 600 years ſtanding.

As for *Martial* his Epiſtle are juſtly ſuſpected.

Objection, *But the ſign of the croſs is not uſed in Baptiſm, but when Baptiſm is ended*

Anſwer. If you take Baptiſm only for that dipping and ſprinkling of the party it is true, and ſo none of the popiſh additions, whereby they defile that holy Sacrament are in Baptiſm, for thoſe which *Bellarmine* accompanie Baptiſm are not impious, but if you take Baptiſm as indeed we do, for the adminiſtration of the Sacrament, then both the prayers before & the prayers after, the actions after the dipping; do all indifferently belong to one and the ſelf ſame thing, yea it is all one continual action of the Adminiſtration of the Sacrament.

Sure it is that it muſt be ſaid to be, either in Baptiſm or out of Baptiſm, or no where; if it be out of Baptiſm, how is it by common conſent of all, ſaid to be the ſign of the croſs in Baptiſme.

Object. *The ſign of the croſs is very ancient.*

Anſwer. So are many other Popiſh Traditions: And if on that ground we are to retain it, why do we not give the baptized milk and hony accordingly. Why do we not bring offerings for the dead. For *Tertullian* the firſt of

of the Fathers that ever mentioned the croſs, doth eſtabliſh theſe, and the ſign of the croſs, by one and the ſelf ſame warranty. Beſides, if upon the Fathers Tradition we uſe the croſs, then muſt we receive and uſe it as they have delivered it unto us, that is, with opinion of vertue and efficacy, not only in the act of bleſſing our ſelves, and in the expelling of Devils, but even in the conſecration of the bleſſed Sacrament. For the firſt, *Tertullian* is witneſſe, ſaying, *At every paſſage, at every ſetting forward, at every coming in and going out, at putting on of our cloaths, ſhoes, &c. We ſtamp our fore-head with the ſign of the croſs.*

De coron mil.

For chaſing of Devils, *Jerom* counſelleth *Demetrias* to uſe the croſs, ſaying. *And with often croſſing guard thy fore-head, that the deſtroyer of Ægypt find no place in thee.* Lactantius ſaith, *Chriſts followers do by the ſign of the croſs, ſhut out the unclean ſpirit.* Chryſoſtom in Pſalm 109. *The croſs guardeth the mind, it taketh revenge on the Devil, it cureth the diſeaſes of the ſoul, &c.*

Epiſtola ad Demetriam. Lib. 4. cap. 27.

But theſe ſuperſtitions are ſmall in regard of that efficacy which in the Sacraments, antiquity aſcribed unto the croſs, for *Cyprian* (being the ancienteſt that maketh mention of the croſs in Baptiſm) ſpeaking of it. *Whoſe virtue, perfecteth all Sacraments, without which ſign nothing is holy, nor any conſecration taketh effect, and whoſoever are the Miniſters of the Sacraments, whatſoever hands do dip or anoint the comers to Baptiſm, out of whatſoever mouth the ſacred word do proceed, the Authority of Operation doth by the ſign of the croſs, make effectuall Sacraments.*

Cyprian de paſſione.

It were ſuperfluous to rehearſe the reſt. But hereby it is evident that the religious uſe of the croſs, was even at the firſt ſinful and ſuperſtitious, neither can it be ſhewed, that ever it was uſed by the Fathers, *religionis ergò ſine admixta ſuperſtitione*, and this invention did no ſooner creep into the Sacrament, but it drew unto it ſelf ſuch ſuperſtitious conceit of efficacy and neceſſity, that without it the means which God appointed for the conſecration of the Elements ſeemed over-weak, yea, unavailable, according as ſome (*e*) amongſt us account not their children lawfully baptized, yea will have them rebaptized, if the croſs have been omitted, out of which may be obſerved, firſt how dangerous a thing it is to bring any humane invention into the ſervice of God, ſith in the very pure age of the Church, it was puniſhed with ſuch a ſpiritual curſe of horrible ſuperſtition.

Lately in Surry a child rebaptized, becauſe the croſs was omitted.

Secondly, though at this time popery was not hatched, yet the myſtery of iniquity was then a working, and the beginning as it were of the whoriſh fornications was found even in the Fathers times, ſo that, as worſhipping of Angels in *Pauls* time, prayers and oblations for the dead in *Tertullians* time, be rightly counted Popiſh and Antichriſtian, though as yet that monſter was not born: So this and other ceremonies ratified by the popiſh canons and conſtitutions, may well be taken for Popiſh and Antichriſtian, even in the Fathers times, ſeeing they then made away for the beaſt, and ſince have received further impiety and authority from him: wherefore to conclude as *Iſay* exhorteth Gods people, to keep themſelves from the rites and pollutions of the heathen, ſaying, depart, depart ye, go out from them and touch no unclean thing: So the ſpirit in the ſame manner chargeth the Church not to meddle with the corruptions of Antichriſtian *Babylon*, but go out of her my people ſaith he, that ye may not be partaker of her ſins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.

Coloſſ. 2. 18.

Eſay. 52. 11.

Apoc. 18. 4.

The fear of which curſe doth keep us from all the ſuperſtitious and Idolatrous ceremonies of that whoriſh Synagogue.

August 1660.

Books lately printed to acquaint those that are studious what are extant, divers of them being Printed this Moneth.

Doctor *Arrowsmith* Chain of Principles. 4°
Mr. *Ambrose* Looking to Jesus. 4°
Mr. *Burroughs* on the Beatitudes and Attributes 4°
Mr. *John Ball* of Divine Meditation. 8°
Mr. *Baxter* of Self-Deniall. 4°
———Sermon before the King 4°
Mr. *Clarkes* Cases of Conscience, *Fol.*
Confession of Faith, with the large Catechism and small by the Reverend Assembly of Divines. Large 4°
Dickson on the Epistles. *Fol.*
Fullers Mixt Meditation in better Times. 8°
Mr. *Gillespie* on the English Popish Ceremonies. 4°
Dr. *Gauden* Loosing of St. *Peters* bonds. 4°
———Setting forth the League and Covenant.
Mr. *Crofts* Answer to Dr. *Gauden.*
The Kingdoms *Remembrancer*: or the Solemn League and Covenant animadverted.
Mr. *Hall* against Maygames.
Mr. *Hickman*, *Laudensium Apostasia*; or a Dialogue, in which is shewn that some Divines since the late Arch-Bishop are in sundry points quite fallen off from the Doctrine received in the Church of *England.* 4°
Jessop, Angel of the Church of *Ephesus.* 4°
Mr. *Manton* on Jude. 4°
Sir *Will. Morrice* on the Sacrament. *Fol.*
———Modest discourse concerning Ceremonies. 4°
Dr. *Owen* of Communion. 4°
Mr. *Patrick* on Baptisme. 12°
Lords Supper. 8°
Hearts Ease. 8°
A Sermon at Mr. *Jacombs* Funerall.
Bishop *Richardson* on the Old Testament, *Fol.* recommended by Bish. *Usher.*
Mr. *Rutherford* of Divine Influences. 4°
Rogers on the parable of a Friend at Mignight, and of the figless Figtree. 4°
Reasons of the necessity of Reformation in Doctrine, Ceremonies, Worship, and Government by severall Ministers.
Mr. *Obediah Sedgwick* on the Covenant of Grace. *Fol.*
Mr. *Sheph[illegible]* on the parable of the ten Virgins. *Fol.*

...God,
...in the very pure age of the Church, it was punished with such a spiritual curse of horrible superstition.

Secondly, though at this time popery was not hatched, yet the mystery of iniquity was then a working, and the beginning as it were of the whorish fornications was found even in the Fathers times, so that, as worshipping of Angels in *Paules* time, prayers and oblations for the dead in *Tertullians* time, be rightly counted Popish and Antichristian, though as yet that monster was not born: So this and other ceremonies ratified by the popish canons and constitutions, may well be taken for Popish and Antichristian, even in the Fathers times, seeing they then made away for the beast, and since have received further impiety and authority from him: wherefore to conclude as *Isay* exhorteth Gods people, to keep themselves from the rites and pollutions of the heathen, saying, depart, depart ye, go out from them and touch no unclean thing: So the spirit in the same manner chargeth the Church not to meddle with the corruptions of Antichristian *Babylon*, but go out of her my people saith he, that ye may not be partaker of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.

Coloss. 2. 18.

Esay. 52. 11.

Apoc. 18. 4.

The fear of which curse doth keep us from all the superstitious and Idolatrous ceremonies of that whorish Synagogue.

verted.

Mr. *Hall* againſt Maygames.

Mr. *Hickman*, *Laudenſium Apoſtaſia*; or a Dialogue, in which is ſhewn that ſome Divines ſince the late Arch-Biſhop are in ſundry points quite fallen off from the Doctrine received in the Church of *England*. 4°

Jeſſop, Angel of the Church of *Epheſus*. 4°

Mr. *Manton* on Jude. 4°

Sir *Will. Morrice* on the Sacrament. *Fol.*

———Modeſt diſcourſe concerning Ceremonies. 4°

Dr. *Owen* of Communion. 4°

Mr. *Patrick* on Baptiſme. 12°

Lords Supper. 8°

Hearts Eaſe. 8°

A Sermon at Mr. *Jacombs* Funerall.

Biſhop *Richardſon* on the Old Teſtament, *Fol.* recommended by Biſh. *Uſher.*

Mr. *Rutherford* of Divine Influences. 4°

Rogers on the parable of a Friend at Mignight, and of the figleſs Figtree. 4°

Reaſons of the neceſſity of Reformation in Doctrine, Ceremonies, Worſhip, and Government by ſeverall Miniſters.

Mr. *Obediah Sedgwick* on the Covenant of Grace. *Fol.*

Mr. *Shepheard* on the parable of the ten Virgins. *Fol.*

Smectymnuus Redivivus, a Treatiſe of Liturgy and Epiſcopacy by five learned Divines; Mr. *Stephen Marſhall*, Mr. *Edm: Calamy*, Mr. *Tho: Young*, Mr. *Matthew Newcomen*, Dr. *Will: Spurſtow*. 4°

Biſhop *Uſher*, Reduction of Epiſcopacy with other pieces. 8°

Watſon on the Beatitudes. 4°

Latine Books lately extant.

Rananellus. 2 parts, *Multo auctior*. *Fol.*

Biſhop *Uſher Cron*. 4°

Dallæus de Confirmatione. 4°

Cocceius in Epiſt: ad Hebræos. 4°

Friedlibij obſervationes in Vetus & Nov: Teſtamentum 7. Claſſibus. viz. *Hebraiſmorum*, &c. *Editio 2da. priore vel duplo auctior*. Fol. 2 Vol.

Dr. Arrowſmith *Tactica Sacra*. 4°

Aylesbury *Æterno Dei Decrete*.

Parkeri Theſis. 8°

D. Wilkinſoni Conciones. 8°

22. 9. 49

Printed for *J. Rothwel* at the Fountain in Goldſmiths-Row in *Cheapſide*, 1660.